

**ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED**


B328c
Baur 1874083
ch history of the first
e centuries
STORAGE

DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS FROM POCKET

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT WAYNE AND ALLEN COUNTY, IND.

STO

**ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED**





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-EMD-210

7476 1874083

THE CHURCH HISTORY

OF

THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

BY

DR. FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAUR,

SOMETIME PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF TÜBINGEN.

THIRD EDITION.


The Translation from the German edited by

THE REV. ALLAN MENZIES, B.D.

MINISTER OF ABERNETHY.

VOL. I.

V.1



WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,

14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;

AND 20 SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1878.

THE CHURCH HISTORY

OF

THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES

BY

DR. FERDINAND CHRISTIAN BAEZ

DOMINIC PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THIRD EDITION


THE TRANSLATION FROM THE GERMAN EDITION OF

THE REV. ALAN MENZIES, B.D.

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY

VOL. I

VI



WILLIAMS AND NORRIS

15 N. W. 1ST STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.
AND 20 NORTH LAKEVIEW, CHICAGO, ILL.

1878

CONTENTS

THEOLOGICAL
TRANSLATION FUND LIBRARY.

Vol. 16.

THE CHURCH HISTORY

OF

THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

VOL. I.

PART SECOND

<i>Christianity as a national principle of civilization:</i>	
<i>the conflict between Paganism and Judaism, and</i>	
<i>its adjustment to the form of the Jewish Church,</i>	41-123
1. The Gentiles	41-98
The Church of Jerusalem and Stephen,	41-48
Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles, and the other	
Apostles,	48-73

CONTENTS.

PART FIRST.

	PAGE
<i>The Entrance of Christianity into the World :</i>	
<i>Primitive Christianity,</i>	1-43
The Universalism of the Roman Empire as a preparation for Christianity,	1-5
Christianity and the old Religions,	6-10
Greek Philosophy,	10-17
Judaism,	17-23
Primitive Christianity : The Gospels,	23-26
The original Christian Principle,	26-33
The Kingdom of God,	33-36
The Person of Jesus—The Messianic Idea,	37-41
The Death and Resurrection of Jesus,	41-43

PART SECOND.

<i>Christianity as a universal principle of Salvation :</i>	
<i>the conflict between Paulinism and Judaism, and</i>	
<i>its adjustment in the idea of the Catholic Church,</i>	44-183
i. The Conflict,	44-98
The Church of Jerusalem and Stephen,	44-46
Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles, and the elder	
Apostles,	46-55

	PAGE
The Apostle Paul and his opponents,	56-65
In Galatia,	56-60
In Corinth,	60-65
The Epistle to the Romans,	65-73
The last journey to Jerusalem,	73-76
The height of the Conflict,	76-98
The Gospel of Luke,	77-82
The Paulinism of Marcion,	82-84
The Judaism of the Apocalypse,	84-87
Papias and Hegesippus,	87-89
The Ebionites of the Clementines,	89
Simon Magus,	90-98
II. The Reconciliation,	99-152
Different views on the subject,	99-104
Points of the Reconciliation,	105-106
Baptism in place of Circumcision,	106-109
Peter the Apostle of the Gentiles,	109-111
Influence of Jewish Christianity on the forma- tion of the Church,	112-114
Mediating tendency of the post-apostolic works included in the Canon,	114-136
The Epistle to the Hebrews,	114-121
The Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians,	122-128
The Pastoral Epistles,	128
The Epistle of James and the First Epistle of Peter,	128-131
The Acts of the Apostles,	131-136
The Apostolic Fathers,	137-142
Justin Martyr,	142-147
Peter and Paul united,	147-152

CONTENTS.

vii

	PAGE
III. Johannine Christianity,	153-183
The Apostle John. The writer of the Apocalypse and the Evangelist,	153-155
The Gospel of John,	155-181
The complete rupture with Judaism,	155-159
Christ the true Passover,	159-163
The Paschal Controversy,	163-177
The higher form of the Christian consciousness,	177-180
Retrospect. The Ebionites,	180-183

PART THIRD.

<i>Christianity as an ideal principle of the world; and as a real phenomenon existing under historical conditions; or, Gnosticism and Montanism, and their Antithesis, the Catholic Church,</i>	185
Gnosticism and Montanism,	185-255
I. Gnosticism,	185-244
Notion and Essence of Gnosticism,	185-190
Its Origin,	190-193
Its main elements: spirit and matter, the Demiurgus and Christ,	193-199
Different sects; forms, and systems of Gnos- ticism,	199-236
Cerinthus, Simon Magus, the Ophites, the Perates,	199-204
Valentinus,	204-213
Basilides,	213-222
Marcion,	223-228
The Pseudo-Clementine Homilies,	228-235
The Three Types,	235-236
Docetism,	237-244

	PAGE
II. Montanism,	245-256
Gnosticism and Montanism,	245
The Belief in the Parousia,	246-248
Chiliasm and Prophecy,	248-250
Reactionary Tendency,	250-255
Origin of Montanism,	255-256

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

A DESIRE has existed for some time and in various quarters to have the results which have been emerging from the most recent critical investigations in the field of primitive Church History brought together in a compendious form. And such a work cannot fail to promote the success of these investigations. On this field of historical inquiry, which requires to be again and again, and more and more thoroughly, discussed, there are many points which, when looked at in themselves, appear unimportant or of doubtful certainty, and which can only be seen in their true light when placed in their proper connection in the history, where the unity of the whole supports and holds fast the parts.

This is the chief object of the following work. But this is not its only object; it is by no means a mere repetition of views which have already been put forward. Even in those sections where, from the nature of the case, little more was necessary than to recapitulate and sum up the main points of my earlier investigations into particular questions, I have not only examined and sifted the materials afresh, and placed the questions under new points of view, but I have also enriched the discussion by the new contributions afforded both by recent examinations of the sources, and by sources which have been recently discovered. Of these latter I have chiefly, to mention the *Philosophoumena*, known under the name of Origen which are of great importance in connection with the history

of Gnosticism and of the earliest Christian doctrine ; and extensive use is here made of them for the first time in the discussion of these subjects. Another Gnostic work to which little attention has hitherto been paid, but which is also a very remarkable one, is *Pistis Sophia* ; and it also has been used here. The principal thing to be mentioned, however, is, that in addition to the work of arrangement and completion which had to be done for these earlier parts, I have in the two last sections of this work advanced beyond the line of my previous works on the apostolic and post-apostolic age. There are certain other sides of the genesis of the Church which have to be taken into consideration in a general description of the Christian Church of the first three centuries, and without which such a description must fall short in completeness and comprehensiveness, as well as in clearness and vividness ; and these sides of the subject have also been set forth in this work.

The standpoint which I have occupied for a long series of years is well known. I adhere to it still as firmly and with as sincere conviction as I have always done ; and there is no need at this time to enter into explanations on the subject. In my work which appeared last year, *Die Epochen der Kirchlichen Geschichtschreibung*, Tübingen, 1852, I have stated my view regarding the treatment of Church History in general, and the leading principles by which writers of Church History have to be guided. That work may thus be regarded as an introduction to this one, in which accordingly these general considerations are omitted. My standpoint is in one word the purely historical one : namely, that the one thing to be aimed at is to place before ourselves the materials given in the history as they are objectively, and not otherwise, as far as that is possible. How far I may have succeeded in this is not for me to say ; but I am not conscious of having followed any other aim, and this consciousness sufficiently protects me against

all insinuations, against those perverted and ill-natured judgments which are unfortunately the fashion of a time which cannot see beyond its own limited party interests. It is needless to refer to writings which bear the most evident marks of one-sidedness, and in which the shallow treatment of history is imperfectly concealed by arrogance of tone. No one can possibly ignore the demands which this, the most important period of the history of the Christian Church, still puts forward for historical investigation. It is confessed on all hands that a great task still confronts us here, and that many questions still await a more satisfactory solution than has hitherto been found for them. Even if we take the best and most accepted works on the history of primitive Christianity, and examine them with a view to see how far they succeed in combining the historical materials which are of so heterogeneous a nature, and have to be collected from such different quarters, to the unity of a whole, how isolated and fragmentary, how destitute of inner principle and motive, how vague and dim do they appear in many respects! And, as we might expect, this want of unity becomes the more apparent the further we go back to those points with regard to which it is first of all required of the historian that he should have made up his mind and formed a definite opinion; since, without definite views with regard to them, no historical conception of the way in which Christianity grew into the Church is possible at all. Every attempt to obtain accuracy and depth in the foundation, which is the first requirement of the historian, and which no one can lay otherwise than as history herself has laid it in her own unchangeable truth, to bring connection, proportion, and unity into the whole woof of the narrative; to separate, according to their different character, the various elements which here co-operate, and the moving forces and principles, the product of which is the result of the first three centuries; to trace the action

of these forces and principles upon each other, and to unite, as far as possible into one harmonious picture, all the individual features which belong to the character of a time so rich in life and movement, —every attempt to do all this must, if it at all fulfils the first requirements for the discharge of such a task, derive its justification from no other source than from itself. It is from this point of view that I would have this work judged by those who are sufficiently impartial, and sufficiently acquainted with the subject, to appreciate the importance of the attempt here made.

Whether I shall afterwards go further on the road I have here begun, I cannot yet distinctly say. It is possible that I may, while not attempting a detailed history, yet indicate the points which my studies and investigations, so far as they have gone, lead me to think most important, in order to follow the general course of the development of the Christian Church. In any case the present work forms a history in itself.

TÜBINGEN, *Sept.* 1853.

PART FIRST.

THE ENTRANCE OF CHRISTIANITY INTO THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD :

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

IN no field of historical study are the whole scope and character of the successive events of which the history is composed so largely determined by the starting-point from which the movement issues, as in the history of the Christian Church : nowhere therefore does so much depend on the conception which we form of that first point with which the whole historical development begins. The historian who approaches his subject imbued with the faith of the Church finds himself confronted at the very outset with the most stupendous of miracles, the fact which lies at the root of Christianity being in his eyes that the only-begotten Son of God descended from the eternal throne of the Godhead to the earth, and became man in the womb of the Virgin. He who regards this as simply and absolutely a miracle, steps at once outside of all historical connection. Miracle is an absolute beginning, and since as such it must needs qualify all that follows, the whole series of phenomena which fall within the range of Christianity must bear the same miraculous character. Historical connection having once been severed at the outset, the same interruption of the historical process is equally possible at any further point. Thus, on the part of those who are interested in the scientific study of history, the desire has naturally arisen to show how the miracle of the absolute beginning may itself be regarded as a link of the chain of history, and to resolve it, so far as the case admits, into

its natural elements. This has often been attempted, and the attempts made in this direction have been subjected to many and various criticisms; but whatever our judgment on this point may be, it cannot really alter the nature of our task. Though we go no further than to ask, why the miracle with which the history of Christianity begins was brought to bear on the world's history at this particular point of time, yet we have raised a series of questions which can only be answered by historical treatment. Our first task, then, in a history of Christianity or of the Christian Church, must be to place ourselves at the point where Christianity enters into the stream of the world's history, and to gain a general idea of its relation to the other elements of the history of the time. With this end we have first of all to ask, whether there is anything in Christianity which we may recognise as, on the one hand, belonging to the essence of that religion, and, on the other, expressive of the general character of the age in which it appeared? If any such points of contact can be distinctly recognised, a ray of light will at once be shed on the historical origin of Christianity.

Now some of the early Christian apologists considered it to be a fact of great significance that their religion had appeared precisely at the time at which the Roman empire arrived at the summit of its power, and came to embrace the whole world in its dominion. All that they inferred from this was, that even in the eyes of the heathen a religion could not but appear auspicious whose epoch coincided with the culmination of the prosperity of the Roman empire.¹ Even on this ground the coincidence of Christianity with the universal empire of Rome appeared to them too remarkable to be ascribed to chance. The true point of contact, however, between Christianity and the Empire is the universal tendency which is common to both. It is a consideration of real significance for the history of the world, that the epoch which saw the Roman empire complete the union of all the nations of the world as it then was in a universal monarchy, also witnessed the

¹ Cf. the Fragment of the Apology of Melito of Sardes, given by Eusebius, *Ecll. Hist.* iv. 26; and Origen, *contra Celsum*, ii. 30.

beginning of the religion in which all religious particularism disappeared and gave way to universalism. Christianity thus stood, in respect of its universalism, at the stage which had already been attained by the power and genius of Rome in its world-wide monarchy. In fact we may say that the time had come when the human spirit was to make this momentous advance. As the barriers and divisions between different countries and nationalities were dissolved before the ever-advancing power of the Romans, and their general subjection to a common head caused men to be aware of the unity in which their differences disappeared, the whole spiritual consciousness was proportionately enlarged, and found itself led more and more to disregard the distinctions and exclusiveness which separated men from each other, and to lay hold of what was universal. The general tendency of the age towards an all-embracing unity, in which all that was separate and exclusive might be taken up and disappear, found its greatest and most imposing expression in the universalism of the Roman empire. But this universalism was the very goal to which the history of the world had been tending for centuries before. The conquests of Alexander the Great had opened to the West the portals of the East, and the new routes to the East had developed an active traffic which brought men of all races in contact with each other, and thus diffused the Greek language and culture over the whole of the known world. It was but another step in the same path of historical development when the dominion of the Romans cast over the nations of the world the new bond of political unity. The forms which made this unity possible had never existed before : it arose on the broad basis of Roman civilisation and law, and operated through the vast and well-articulated organism of the Roman state. The nations thus found themselves placed in relations to each other which tended inevitably not only to melt away the stiffness and unsociableness of their previous attitude to one another, but even to obliterate all merely national or individual distinctions, and to produce a broad sense of universality in which minor differences ceased to be felt. The union was not a

merely political one : it also bound the different races of the world together in a new bond of mental sympathy. The influence which was working to this end was not to be escaped even by that race which had always been most broadly distinguished from the rest by its peculiar national character, and which had always maintained its own national peculiarities most obstinately and persistently. By the double destruction of their state the Jews were cast out among other nations throughout the wide world. When the successors of Alexander founded their kingdoms, the Jews became an important element of the new population which arose in these new towns, which were to be the chief centres of the political and intellectual intercourse of different races. Here they became Hellenists, and assimilated all the various elements of Greek culture. Finally they were drawn into the ever-widening net of the Roman dominion : and so it came about that Christianity, arising as it did on Jewish soil, stood even at its birthplace in contact with the power that was destined to be its forerunner on the road to the conquest of the world.

Thus the universalism of Christianity necessarily presupposes the universalism of the Roman empire. But in considering how these two great powers now came into contact with each other, we must not rest content with the ordinary view, which starting from the standpoint of teleology, considering merely the outward circumstances and relations amidst which Christianity entered into the world, sees in them the special favour of divine Providence, which, it is thought, could have selected no fitter time than this for the accomplishment of its designs. In this view the great fact in connection with the subject is thought to be nothing more than that the opening up of so many new routes for traffic facilitated the diffusion of Christianity throughout the provinces of the Roman empire, and that the protection of the Roman police and civil order removed many hindrances which might otherwise have obstructed the progress of the messengers of the gospel.¹

¹ Cf. Origen, in *loc. cit.* To the objection of Celsus, that the sun first displays himself by illuminating all other things, and that the Son of God ought to have

But the bond of connection between the religion and the polity is a much deeper and more intimate one than this, and is to be looked for in the general spiritual movement of the time of which both are manifestations. What we have to keep in mind is, that Christianity never could have been that general form of the religious consciousness which it is, had not the whole development of the world's history, up to the time when it appeared, been preparing for it. First came the general intellectual culture which the Greeks made the common property of the world, and then the Roman rule uniting the nations, and introducing political institutions, which served as a basis for universal civilisation. By these agencies the barriers raised by national sentiment had been broken down, and many differences softened which had tended to keep the nations apart from each other, not only in their outward relations, but in the inner sphere of thought and feeling. The universalism of Christianity could never have become a part of the general consciousness of the nations, had not political universalism prepared the way for it. The universalism of Christianity is essentially nothing but that universal form of consciousness at which the development of mankind had arrived at the time when Christianity appeared.

displayed himself in the same way, Origen answers, that such had been his manifestation. "Righteousness arose in his days, and the fulness of peace was at hand from the moment of his birth: while God was preparing the nations for his doctrine, and providing that all men should obey the one Roman emperor: lest, if there were a number of kings and nations strange to each other, it might be more difficult for the Apostles to do what Jesus commanded them, saying, Go, teach all nations. It is well known, however, that Jesus was born under the reign of Augustus, who had bound together in one empire the great multitude of the dispersed inhabitants of the world. A plurality of kingdoms would have been a hindrance to the free dissemination of the doctrine of Jesus throughout the whole world; both from what we have said above, and especially because men would have been obliged to make wars for the defence of their particular countries: as had been the case before the times of Augustus and even earlier, when war was unavoidable between the Peloponnesians and the Athenians, and in the case of other nations also. How then could this peaceful doctrine which does not even allow men to revenge the injuries of their enemies, ever have made way, had not the affairs of the world been composed, at the time of the advent of Jesus, to a more peaceful state?"

Thus, when we place ourselves at the point at which Christianity enters into the world's history, and inquire into its general historical bearing, we find that it is a universal form of the religious consciousness which answers to the spirit of the age, and for which the history of the nations had long been preparing. But how comes Christianity to be this universal form of religion? Its claim to be so called is founded on the fact, that it has more and more pressed back the other religions, resolving them into itself, and has risen above them to the most wide-spread dominion over the world. As against those special forms of religion it is therefore the absolute religion. But what is it in Christianity that gives it its absolute character? The first and obvious answer to this question is, that Christianity is elevated above the defects and limitations, the one-sidedness and finiteness, which constitute the particularism of other forms of religion. It is not polytheistic like Paganism: it does not, like Judaism, attach itself to outward rites and ordinances, nor identify itself with the positive authority of a purely traditional religion. To speak broadly, it is a more spiritual form of the religious consciousness than these are, and stands above them. This, however, is saying very little: this is self-evident as soon as we begin to compare Christianity with the two other religions which it had to encounter. When Christianity first made itself felt as a power of permanent importance, Judaism and Paganism had long fallen into decay. They had lost their deeper application to the religious life of their peoples, and had become mere external forms, devoid of substance and vitality. Paganism had sunk into the mindless religion of the vulgar. With all educated men belief in the old gods had become more or less disconnected with the religious feelings. The myths in which the simpler faith of the earlier world had found expression for its fairest religious intuitions, seemed now mere fables, in which there was no spiritual bond to join form and contents in harmonious union: or they were mere symbols to represent ideas which had arisen on a totally different soil. What alone continued to engage men's interest in the maintenance of the national religion, was,

that as the religion of the State it was closely intertwined with all the functions of the national life, and could only with great difficulty have been separated from them. Judaism, no doubt, had a deeper religious foundation to rest-on. To the Jew the religion of his fathers was never a mere name: there was no failure of the veneration with which the worship of the temple, with its vast array of elaborate ceremonies, was regarded. But the appearance of numerous sects and parties, at variance with one another on the most fundamental questions, showed unmistakably that here also the national religion was tending to dissolution. These two religions had thus been making way for a new religion; and if we look at the subject from the teleological point of view, we cannot but hold it to have been by the special arrangement of divine Providence that Christianity appeared precisely at the time at which there was so great a void to be filled up in the religious life of the ancient world. But this view fails, as much as that to which we formerly referred, to give us any further insight into the connection in which Christianity, as a new form of the religious consciousness, stands to the previous development of religion.

Now the main connection between the old religions and Christianity has generally been taken to consist in the absence from the former of what Christianity supplied. In many respects, it is said there is a positive antagonism between it and them. But apart from this, we may find the point of connection in the religious feelings and cravings which the old religions failed to satisfy. The unbelief and superstition which were present in Paganism and Judaism were certainly opposed to Christianity; yet there were elements present in that unbelief and superstition which facilitated a transition to Christianity, arising as they did from a state of feeling which was very favourable to its reception. There were various kinds of unbelief. There was an unbelief which sprang from a craving for belief which received no satisfaction from all that the philosophy and religion of the old world gave. The human heart has a desire which will not be denied

to know and to have intercourse with the supernatural. The prevalence of an all-denying scepticism does not quench the desire, but rather intensifies it. The same was the case with the correlative of unbelief, superstition. At the root of much of it there lay a need which looked for satisfaction, and which could find it only in Christianity, the need of deliverance from the deep-felt schism within, and of atonement with an unknown God. This was what men were seeking, whether or not they were consciously aware of it.¹

Here we are referred to the immediate religious sense as the ground why men were prepared to receive Christianity. Now Christianity indubitably has its roots, as every other religion has, in this primary ground of all religious life. But to refer Christianity to nothing but this is no explanation at all of the general question: this is merely a vague and general speculation how individuals might be affected. The question is not what peculiar frame of mind or position of circumstances might dispose this or that individual to adopt Christianity. We have to regard Christianity not as it affected individuals, but objectively, as an influence affecting the world. It must have had some connection with the previous religious development of the world, not merely in the way of difference, but also in the way of similarity and of adopting what it found. And we have to inquire what this connection was. We have seen that the universal tendency of Christianity presupposed the universalism to which the general consciousness of the age had broadened out under the influence of the Roman empire. Now, if this be the case, it must be no less true that those elements of Christianity which make it an absolute as well as a universal religion stood in the same vital and necessary connection with the previous religious and spiritual development of the world. Here, however, it is of the first importance not to take up any narrow or one-sided notion of what the absolute character of Christianity consists in. Some

¹ Compare Neander's General History of the Christian Religion and Church, i. 5, 87. and 46. (Bohn's translation.)

- (1) For instance, both in the Osirian and Mithraic cult
 (2) Osiris, Mithra, Serapis, Dionysus &c.

THE OLD RELIGIONS.

9

have thought to find it in the fact that Christianity gives so full and welcome a satisfaction to man's longing for belief, or in the fact that it is a supernatural revelation, a system of universal efficacy for the reconciliation of man with God, or in the fact that it places before us in the person of its founder one who is the Son of God and the God-man, in the sense in which the Church uses these words. But this only leads to the question what there is in these features of Christianity to place it so high above the old religions. For in one way or another these elements of religion were believed to be present in them all. (1) Every religion claimed to be a supernatural revelation; there was no want of arrangements for bringing about the reconciliation of man with God, and the communion of man with God was believed before Christianity to be provided for by beings whose functions were nearly the same as those of the Christian Son of God. (2) What is it, then, that gives Christianity its peculiar and specific superiority above all that more or less resembled it in the ancient world? Again, Christianity may be regarded under various points of view, each of which will only exhibit to us one of its various sides. But what is Christianity itself? What common unity underlies these different aspects, and combines them into a whole? We answer in a word, its spirituality. We find Christianity to be far more free than any other religion from everything merely external, sensuous, or material. It lays its foundations more deeply in the inmost essence of man's nature and in the principles of the moral consciousness. It knows, as it says of itself, no worship of God but the worship in spirit and in truth. When we inquire what constitutes the absolute character of Christianity, we must point to its spirituality. In this wide view of the absolute nature of Christianity, let us inquire what points of contact it presents with the movement prior to or contemporary with its appearance. What features do we find in the general advance of the human mind during those ages that may be said to be akin to Christianity, and to have been essentially preparing the way for its reception?

Decay and dissolution, as we have said, had completely seized

(1) on the old religions. At the time when they came in contact with Christianity, no one who had become aware of their imperfection and finiteness, or who had seen them as they really were, could escape the sense of an infinite void, or fail to feel a craving for a contentment which nothing in the whole range of these religions could give, and a need for something positive to which the religious instinct might attach itself. But what had so thoroughly broken up the old faiths? They were crumbling into ruins before Christianity came to touch them. Some other power must have been at work on them which was stronger than they. It is a mistake to think that ages of transition, like that immediately preceding the appearance of Christianity, are simply times of decay and disintegration, when all spiritual and religious life is completely moribund. At such a time the old forms in which religion used to move do indeed decay. What used to fill them with life and reality departs from them, till the hollow forms alone are left. But the very cause of this process is, that the spirit, whose religious feelings the forms once served to express, has expanded and risen beyond them. Where an old system decays we may be sure it is because the new truth which is to succeed it is already there; the old would not decay if the new had not arrived, be it but in germ, and been long labouring to undermine and eat away the existing structure. It may be long before a new kind of spiritual life takes such shape as to arrest the notice of the world. But the plastic spirit is active all the while, though unobserved; the leaven is working deep out of sight, and the unresting vital process cannot be stayed, but goes evenly and regularly forward, in its successive stages, until it has produced a new creation.

The decay of Paganism is not to be dated from the time when Christianity appeared, and can in no way be said to have been brought about by Christianity. It had been in course of progress ever since Greek religion began to be accompanied by Greek philosophy. Not only did this philosophy deal with the popular mythical beliefs in the way of critical reflection, and so place itself

above them, but it created a new world which arose in total independence of the popular faith, in the realm of pure thought. In this world the spirit which could no longer find its adequate expression in the myths of the popular religion, found a new sphere for its thought and intuition. Thus, next to the religious teaching of the Old Testament, Greek philosophy forms the most important spiritual antecedent of Christianity. And its relation to Christianity has always been one of chief points taken up in the attempts that have been made to estimate the true position of Christianity in history. But here also it has been customary to urge the negative rather than the positive side of the relation; and only in the case of Platonism is it perceived that along with much which was defective and one-sided it possessed elements which prepared the way for Christianity. It spiritualised religious thought; it turned away from the many gods of Paganism, and pointed to a certain spiritual Divine unity above them; it struck out many ideas which are akin to Christianity, as that of a redemption, in the sense of deliverance from the blind power of nature which opposes the divine; it gave the elevating conception of a divine life which stood above the influence of the Nature-powers. Much more unfavourable judgments are passed not only on Epicureanism but even on Stoicism. It is self-evident, we are told, that a system like the former, offering atheism for theology, and making happiness the highest good, is utterly alien to Christianity. And it is urged that there is the strongest possible contrast between the humility of the believing Christian and the proud self-sufficiency of the Stoic sage. Such indeed must be our judgment, so long as we confine our attention to the points where the contrast is most evident and extreme. But our task is not to attend to mere particulars. We have rather to attempt to interpret all the phenomena in question as parts of the great historical development. The question we have to ask is, how Greek philosophy, such as it was from its principal epoch downwards, was related to Christianity?

In how different a light does this question appear when we call to mind the well-known parallel drawn by so many writers between

Socrates and Christ! The parallel is certainly not without justice. Christianity closes a movement which arose upon the soil of Pagan religion and philosophy, and the seed of which was sown by Socrates. And if this be the case, then each of the principal forms assumed by Greek philosophy during this interval must have been a step in the preparation for Christianity. An investigation of the course taken by Greek thought during this most important period will contribute much to make it clear to us why Christianity entered into the world at this particular time and at no other. Those who hold the essence of Christianity to be its character as a supernatural revelation, can see little need for expatiating over so wide a field in inquiring after its origin. To go back to the epoch of Socrates must seem to them superfluous. But in any case Christianity must be acknowledged to have a genuinely human side; and when we try to form a distinct conception of its first beginnings, of the manner in which it made its way into the world and sought to win an entrance to men's hearts, its genuinely human character comes clearly before us. The words in which it first announces itself to the world, its call for *μετάνοια*, its bidding men go into themselves, this at once defines the relation which it takes up towards man, and the stand-point from which it interprets the relation between man and God. It begins with an earnest call to man to direct his gaze within, to turn in to himself, to become acquainted with himself in the deep places of his own self-consciousness. In this way he is to learn what his relation to God is, and what it ought to be, and to become aware of those needs in his moral nature out of which the cry for redemption proceeds, in all their depth and intensity. Looking away from all that is unessential, and asking what is the element in Christianity which makes it a religion in the absolute sense, we find that it rests on man's knowledge of himself as a moral subject. Had not man's moral consciousness been already fully developed in all those bearings which lend it its profounder interests, Christianity could not have gained a footing in the world in its peculiar character as an essentially moral religion.

Now when and how was it that man first recognised himself as a moral being? It was when he awoke to the idea of himself as a subject, a being essentially distinct from and independent of the world without: when he first grasped the principle of subjectivity, that the true standard of thought and action is in the inner life. Socrates marks an epoch, because this step of progress is due to him.¹ He first urged, that man should come back to himself, and search his own being: the mind was to withdraw from the outward world, and to concentrate itself on the world within. Thus, occupying himself with the contents of pure thought, man would find himself face to face with the only real and true existences. In the same way, in the practical sphere, by referring virtue to knowledge, by following the command 'know thyself,' and turning the moral consciousness back upon itself, man was to find in the conviction which arose out of his own nature his rule of action. From this point forward we have a long and uninterrupted series of philosophical developments. First the Platonic and Aristotelian theories of knowledge, which aimed at determining the general nature of things, then the ethical systems of the Stoics and Epicureans, and following on the last, the Sceptical and Eclectic movements, in all of which practical interests were more and more preferred to theoretical, and the moral nature of man was regarded in the same light as Christianity regards it, and made the chief object of philosophical reflection. More directly and earnestly than any other schools, the Stoics and Epicureans applied themselves to discover man's moral end, and the conditions under which it is attained. All those questions to which so many discussions were devoted, concerning the idea of the good, the highest good, the relation of virtue to happiness, the value of moral action, etc., are but the ethical expression of the problem laid before man by Christianity as a question of religion. Divergent as the two systems were, the very opposition between them served to rouse

¹ Cf. my Essay: *Das Christliche d. Platonismus, oder Socrates und Christus*, p. 20; in the *Drei Abhandlungen*, Leipzig, 1875, 247 sq. Zeller: *die Philos. d. Griechen*, 2d edition, ii. 78; p. 100 in Reichel's translation.

moral thought. The moral consciousness of the age was so enlarged and educated in every direction by these discussions, that Christianity found the ground prepared on which its higher moral and religious task could be accomplished.

Stoicism, on the ground of the strictness and purity of its principles, may seem to claim an unquestionable superiority over Epicureanism. But it has justly been acknowledged¹ that the latter system, leading man away from the outer world, and bidding him seek his highest happiness in the fair humanity of a cultivated mind content with itself, did a useful work; that by its mildness, no less than Stoicism by its austerity, it contributed to develop and diffuse a free and universal morality. Both schools started from the common leading idea of the post-Aristotelian philosophy—the postulate, that man should withdraw himself within the sphere of his inner consciousness, and seek for his perfect contentment there. The vocation and happiness of man, according to the one, are found in that submission of the individual to the reason and the law of the universe, which is virtue. According to the other, they consist in independence of all external things, in consciousness of this independence, in the undisturbed enjoyment of the life a man has to live, in freedom from pain. Thus, although by different ways, both sought to reach the same goal, namely, the freedom of the conscious self: and this led them at once to a position which is quite inconsistent with the fundamental religious sentiment of Christianity. The wise man of the Stoics, and the wise man of the Epicureans, are ideals equally strange to Christianity. The common endeavour of the two systems to make man free by bidding him rest on nothing but himself, to confer upon him, in the infiniteness of his thought and self-consciousness, complete independence of all without him, involves both in the same contrast with the Christian feeling of dependence. But even the Stoic saw himself compelled to descend from the height of his moral idealism, and to recognise its limita-

¹ Zeller: *die Philos. d. Griechen*, ii. 263; *Stoics and Epicureans* (Dr. Reichel's translation), p. 445 *sq.*

tions in the presence of practical needs. And as we mark how Scepticism was the next stage at which Greek philosophy arrived in its development out of these systems, we see that that unbounded freedom of the inward consciousness which they claimed led to nothing but the discovery of the essential limits of knowledge. The opposing tendencies were found to be mutually destructive, knowledge was despaired of, and the mind withdrew into itself. But though drawing back into itself and seeking to suffice for itself without the support of outward positive truth, the mind could not remain so entirely inactive as not to turn to one alternative or another as the more probable. Thus Scepticism in its turn gave birth to Eclecticism. This mode of thought escaped from the harshness and one-sidedness of the earlier schools by choosing the best that it could find, and removing the features that it desired to retain from their logical connection in the systems to which they originally belonged. And we are concerned to notice that Eclecticism readily lent itself to promote the union of religion with practical interests. At the Christian era it was more widely diffused than any other way of thinking, and had grown into a popular philosophy and natural theology. The writings of its chief representatives, Cicero, Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius, contain many elements allied to Christianity. Indeed, so much is this the case that their views and doctrines might appear to be something more than merely the approved result of all the ethical discussion that had gone before, as it had learned to meet the practical wants of the age. In reading their writings we seem to be upon the ground of Christian moral and religious teaching. We come upon sentences the Christian tone of which surprises us.

The fixed first principle of Eclecticism (which, like other systems, required a standard whereby to test different opinions) is with Cicero, the best known and most popular writer of the school, the immediate consciousness of man, his inner self-assurance, the natural instinct for truth, or innate knowledge. The germs of morality are implanted in us. Nature has not only given us the

moral faculty, but has bestowed on us the fundamental ethical conceptions, as an original endowment, and prior to any instruction; our task is merely to work out these innate conceptions. The nearer a man stands to nature the more clearly will these original ideas be reflected in him: it is from children that we learn what is in conformity with nature. The belief in God rests on a like foundation. By virtue of the affinity of the human spirit to God, the knowledge of God is given to us along with the knowledge of ourselves. Man need but recollect his own origin, and he is led to his Creator. Nature itself, therefore, tells us of the existence of God: and the strongest proof of this truth is its universal recognition.¹ In these few sentences we see clearly traced the outlines of a natural theology, the construction of which was afterwards continued within Christianity and on a genuinely Christian foundation. The view which declares that the consciousness of self is also, and at once, the consciousness of God, will naturally arrive at the conclusion that man's original knowledge is a thing given him from without, and will look to receive in the immediate consciousness itself, but from some source of knowledge higher than our finite selves, the revelation of Deity. It was in such a longing for a higher communication of truth and an immediate revelation that Greek philosophy finally terminated its course in Neo-Platonism.

¹ Cf. Zeller ii. 585. The natural theology which arose upon the foundation of Stoicism appears in its purest form, and attains its closest analogy to the doctrines of Christianity, in the writings of Seneca. Cf. my dissertation, *Seneca und Paulus: das Verhältniss des Stoicismus zum Christenthum nach den Schriften Seneca's*; (originally in Hilgenfeld's *Ztschr.* 1858, p. 161, 441—now re-published in the "*Drei Abhandlungen*" cited above). I have there pointed out a peculiar characteristic of Seneca's Stoicism, viz., his tendency, in proportion as he departs from the old system of the Porch, to approach the Christian religious position. I have considered this tendency under the following heads: 1. God and the feeling of dependence. 2. Man and his need of salvation. 3. The relation of man to his fellow-men. 4. The belief in a future life. 5. The difference of principle between the Stoic and the Christian views of the world. I have tried to show the groundlessness of the conclusion, that the above-mentioned tendency must be ascribed to Seneca's having made acquaintance with Christianity as it was preached in his neighbourhood.

Thus our survey of the progress of Greek thought shows us that Christianity, which we are considering in its relation to Paganism, entered the general stream of history at an epoch when preparation had been made for it in many and important ways. It came at a time when the heathen world had come to feel the profound significance of the moral consciousness, and all that was most spiritual and most practically important in the results arrived at during the whole long course of Greek ethical speculation had become the common belief, the essential contents of the mind of the age. All men now recognised the truth that man was a moral being called to devote his life to fulfilling a definite moral task. In Christianity the various tendencies which had hitherto been seeking the same end by different ways meet together to be fixed in definite notions and presented in the fullest and richest expression. Such, when approached from the side of Paganism, is the position of Christianity in the chain of history. As the absolute religion, however, it unites both the older religions. Let us therefore consider that element in it which lies towards Judaism, and observe how on this side also it embraces in itself the highest spiritual attainments which Judaism had made.

Christianity arose on Jewish soil, and it is connected with Judaism far more closely and directly than with Paganism. It professes to be nothing more than spiritualised Judaism : it strikes its deepest roots into the soil of the Old Testament religion. In Paganism, Greek philosophy had developed the moral consciousness till it reached a stage at which Christianity could combine with it : in Judaism religion arrived at the stage at which Christianity could adopt it. The special superiority which distinguished the Hebrew religion from all the religions of the heathen world was the pure and refined monotheistic idea of God, which from the earliest times had been the essential foundation of the Old Testament faith. In its consciousness of God, therefore, Christianity feels itself at one with Judaism as with no other faith. The God of the Old Testament is the God of the New, and all the teaching of the Old Testament concerning the essential distinctness of God

from the world, and the absolute majesty and holiness of his nature, is also an essential part of Christian doctrine. But on the other hand the Old Testament conceived God as the God, not of the human race, but of a particular nation. And the particularism, the limitation of the blessings and hopes of religion to the Jewish race, which was partly the cause and partly the effect of this conception of God, stood in the strongest contrast to the spirit of Christianity. If the Old Testament notion of God was ever to be a sufficient form for that consciousness of God which belonged to the universal and absolute nature of Christianity, it was necessary that it should first be freed from this national one-sidedness and defectiveness. It was necessary that it should discard all that belonged only to the narrow range of vision of the Jewish theocracy, and that it should no longer, in accordance with the conceptions of antiquity, ascribe to God a human form and human passions.

The historical experiences of the Jews had an important influence on their religion. Not only did their religious conceptions undergo various modifications, their religious consciousness itself did not stand still, but became gradually wider and more spiritual. On the other hand, however, the hard fortunes of the people only made them cling more strongly to their belief that they alone were the people of God, and to their national prejudices and traditional observances. In this respect the circumstances by which the Jews were surrounded in the kingdoms founded after the death of Alexander, especially in Egypt, and in such a city as Alexandria, first brought a radical change. Here first took place that transformation of Judaism by which it passed beyond the barriers of its national and political exclusiveness, and accepted the influence of new and formerly alien and repugnant ideas.¹ The dispersion of the Jews among foreign nations had before this brought into existence a new class in whom Judaism was mixed, as the circumstances would have led us to expect, with Greek culture and manners. These formed a link, such as had hitherto been wanting, between Jew

¹ Cf. Georgii: die neuesten Gegensätze in Auffassung der alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie, insbesondere des jüdischen alexandrinismus. Illgen's *Ztschr. für hist. Theologie*, 1839, Nos. 3 and 4.

and Gentile, a circumstance which could not fail to have the most important bearing on the intellectual and religious development of mankind. But the Hellenism which had thus arisen only acquired its full significance when it gave birth to an entirely new form of thought in the Græco-Jewish philosophy which sprang up at Alexandria. At such a place the Jews experienced the full power of the Greek spirit, and the desire to gain a closer acquaintance with the ideas and doctrines of Greek philosophy was not to be resisted. The mere existence of such an interest implied that they had advanced beyond the standpoint of pure Judaism; and the more they occupied themselves with Greek philosophy, and became conscious of its charm, the more did they necessarily find themselves in conflict with the religious views and feelings of their race. On the one hand, they could not shake off their interest in the new ideas; on the other, their ancestral faith affirmed its old indefeasible authority. How was the contradiction to be overcome? The reconciliation was accomplished, as is well known, by allegorical interpretation applied to the Scriptures. According to the Jew's view of his sacred books, nothing could be true which was not to be found in them. They were the source of all truth: they must, therefore, be the source of the ideas which he had now adopted. All that was necessary was to find the right key for the explanation of the books of the Old Testament, and then exegesis could bring forth out of those books the ideas which the commentator himself had unconsciously put into them. In this way there arose an entirely new form of Judaism. Men fancied that they were keeping a firm hold of the old faith, but in reality they had substituted entirely new ideas in its place; and while it was supposed that the new matter was contained in the Old Testament, the words of the text were turned into mere vehicles of a doctrine of which the writers had never dreamed. The peculiar character of this Alexandrine Judaism consisted in this, that the limits of the old Jewish particularism were broken through and set aside, as far as this could possibly be done without completely abandoning the standpoint of the Old Testament religion. The doctrines

of this religion received a form, modified in many respects, and generally freer and more spiritual; new ideas were introduced which involved an entirely different theory of the world from that of Judaism; and above all, the Old Testament conception of God was freed from all those elements which belonged merely to the narrow sphere of the Jewish theocracy, and raised to a much higher plane of thought. The profound influence which the Alexandrian philosophy of religion came afterwards, in its highest and most elaborate form as it appears in the writings of Philo, to exercise on Christian theology, shows distinctly that the mode of thought on which it was based must have had great affinity with the spirit of Christianity.

Our task, however, merely requires us to trace its influence in that narrower sphere where it came into close contact with the very earliest Christianity. From this point of view the two sects of the Therapeutae and the Essenes, especially the latter, are a very noteworthy phenomenon.¹

The Therapeutae are the intermediate link between the Hellenistic Judaism of Alexandria and the Essenes of Palestine. The latter however, closely as they are related to the Egyptian Therapeutae, cannot be classed with them, but must be reckoned among the sects into which the Judaism of Palestine was divided. They represent Judaism in the form which it assumed when the Jew of Palestine came to find in the Graeco-Alexandrian doctrine, what his brethren abroad had already found in it, a deeply religious conception of life. This is what places the Essenes in so close a

¹ On the Essenes, cf. Zeller, iii. 235, Ritschl, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1855, p. 315, *sq.*, and die Entstehung der alt-kathol. Kirche, 2d ed., 179, *sqq.*, traces Essenism to an endeavour to realise the ideal of the priestly kingdom held up before the people of Israel, *Exod.* xix. 6, and to form a society of priests answering to it. Zeller opposes this view, and argues (*Theol. Jahrb.*, 1856, p. 401, *sq.*) for the common supposition of a connection between Essenism and the Orphico-pythagorean discipline and view of life which were so widely diffused in the ancient world, and were not without influence upon the Jews. The considerations which he adduces are enough to confute Hilgenfeld's view, that Essenism owed its origin to the apocalyptic prophecy which was so rife at the time (*Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*; Jena, 1857, p. 245, *sq.*), and are likely to assert themselves against any similarly eccentric theories which may yet be put forth.

relation with Christianity. Of course it cannot be thought for a moment that Christianity itself sprang from Essenism; yet it is impossible not to see that the religious view of life held by the Essenes is far more closely allied to the original spirit of Christianity than any of the peculiar doctrines or practices which distinguished the sects of the Pharisees and Sadducees. They certainly attached great value to certain outward practices, yet they were not entangled either in the ordinances and traditions of the Judaism of the Pharisees, or in the purely external forms of the Levitic temple worship. Their religious feeling was more spiritual and inward than that of the other sects, and had a thoroughly practical tendency. The highest object of life was to them to elevate themselves above the material and sensuous, and to turn their whole activity into a constant exercise of all such practices as could bring them nearer to this great end. The name Essenes indicates that they claimed to be physicians of souls. As such they proceeded on the principle of making use of all means which seemed adapted to promote the soul's healthy and vigorous life, and to keep it ever open to receive the influences and revelations of the higher world. Essenism has many features which remind us of the spirit of primitive Christianity; such as its prohibition of oaths, the zeal it encouraged in the practice of the duties of benevolence, and its community of goods. A peculiarly characteristic trait, however, is its principle of voluntary poverty. The view taken of poverty is, that it is better to be poor and possess as little as possible in this world, in order to be so much the richer in the good things of the world to come.¹ This is the same love of poverty which we find in Christianity when its first disciples are called blessed because they are poor in spirit. We may very reasonably assume that in addition to those who carried out all the outward practices which appear in the description of the sect, Essenism had many friends

¹ Cf. my *Comment. de Ebionitarum origine, et doctrina ab Essenis repetenda*, 1831. Notice the passages which I have there quoted from Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, ed. Mang. ii. 457, *de vita contempl.* p. 473; and from Josephus, *de Bello Jud.* ii. 8. 3. See also Dähne: *die jüdisch-alexandrinische Religionsphilosophie*, i. p. 476.

and sympathisers who did not think it necessary to declare their adherence in this way. It was not only a sect, but a widely diffused way of thinking and a view of life which was carried out with various modifications, in one case with more and in another with less of the element of discipline. We may say that all those who shared in the deep and general tendency of the religious spirit to leave what was outward and concentrate itself upon the inward, were touched more or less by the Essene spirit. If this be so, then Essenism is undoubtedly one of the deepest and most truly spiritual points of contact between Judaism and Christianity. And even when we look at merely outward relations, how near do these allied phenomena of the religious life lie to each other. The Essenes had their settlements in those same Jewish border-lands inhabited by a population mixed with Gentiles, in which Christianity first began to preach the blessedness of the poor. Where else could the gospel which was preached to the poor have found hearts so ready to receive it, as among those meek ones of the land, whose style of piety was in so many ways akin to the attitude of mind out of which Christianity itself proceeded?

Thus we find that all these various movements, starting as they do from such widely different quarters, meet each and all at the same point. When placed in its position as connected with the history of preceding times, Christianity appears as the natural unity of all those elements. Various and manifold as they are, they belong to one and the same process of development. As this process moves gradually forward, and eliminates more and more completely all that bears the stamp of particularism and subjectivity, we see that it can have no other issue than at the point where the origin of Christianity is found. On what grounds then can we regard Christianity itself as a phenomenon purely supernatural, as an absolute miracle introduced into the world's history without the operation of any natural causes, and therefore incapable of being comprehended as belonging to any historical connection, when we find in every direction, wherever we turn, numerous points of connection and affinity in which it is linked with the

most intimate bonds to the whole history of the development of mankind? It contains nothing that was not conditioned by a series of causes and effects going before; nothing that had not been long prepared in different ways, and carried forward towards that stage of development at which we find it in Christianity; nothing that had not been previously recognised in one form or another, as a necessary result of reasoned thought, or as a need of the human heart, or as a requirement of the moral consciousness. What room is there then to wonder that that which had so long been in different ways the goal of all the endeavours of the human reason, and had been forcing itself upon the opening and growing human consciousness as its proper and necessary contents, which could not be denied, should at last have found its simplest, purest, and most natural expression in the form in which it appeared in Christianity?

When, however, we go on to consider the nature of Christianity itself, we find it presented to us under many very different aspects, which do not admit of being all placed under the same point of view. The question thus arises, whether what has been said holds good of Christianity in its whole scope and extent, or only of one particular side of it, and if it applies to that which we must regard as the true core and centre of its organism? When Christianity is considered from the point of view which we have set forth, it is of course obvious that the side of it which is meant is that on which all those points of connection and of affinity are to be found which bring it into so intimate and vital a relation with the whole preceding history of human development. But, it may well be asked, is it on this side that we find the original and substantial essence of Christianity? is it not rather a secondary and subordinate feature of it on which we have been dwelling? Is it possible to speak in any real sense of the essence and contents of Christianity without making the person of its founder the main object of our consideration? Must we not recognise the peculiar character of Christianity as consisting in this, that whatever it is, it is simply on account of the person of its founder? And if this be so, is it

CHURCH HISTORY OF FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

not a matter of very slight importance to seek to understand the nature and contents of Christianity in the light of the connection it may have had with the history of the world? Is not its whole meaning and significance derived from the person of its founder? Can our historical consideration of it set out from any other point than this?

To answer these questions we require to go back to the sources of the gospel history. The most recent critical investigations declare that a great distinction has to be drawn between some of these sources and others.¹ The sources of the Evangelical history are the four gospels. Now the great question is, in what relation we are to place the fourth to the first three. It is impossible to ignore the fact that the conception we form of Christianity will be radically and essentially different, according as we on the one hand take it for granted that the four gospels agree with each other throughout, or on the other recognise the divergences between the Johannine gospel and the three Synoptics as amounting to a contradiction which renders a historical unity impossible.²

¹ Cf. my work : *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien*, Tüb. 1847. Köstlin: *der Ursprung und die Composition der synoptischen Evangelien*, Stuttgart, 1853. Hilgenfeld: *die Evangelien nach ihrer Entstehung und geschichtlichen Bedeutung*, Leipzig, 1854.

² The question which has to be dealt with at this stage is not the authenticity of the Johannine gospel; whoever the writer of the gospel may have been, whether the Apostle John or some other man, it is a plain matter of fact and cannot be denied, that the evangelical history of the fourth gospel is an essentially different one from that of the first three. Now as this historical difference must either be admitted or denied, and no third alternative is possible, we have here the parting of two roads which lead in totally different directions, and issue in totally different conceptions of the whole of Church history. The student who in the strength of dogma overlooks this difference will read the whole history of the Church with other eyes than he who does not regard the interests of dogma as supreme, but makes it his principle that the materials which history has to deal with are to be treated in a strictly historical way. As for the question of authorship, the more the critical dilemma of the Johannine authorship of the gospel and of the Apocalypse is insisted on (as is well done by Lücke in the second edition of his *Introduction to the Revelation of John*, 1852, p. 659-744), the less will any sophistry be able to prevent the great preponderance of evidence from inclining to the side of the Apocalypse, when the external testimonies for the Johannine origin of the two works are fairly and impartially weighed.

If it be assumed that the four gospels agree with each other and are capable of being harmonised, then the absolute importance which the gospel of John assigns to the person of Jesus must determine our whole view of the gospel history. We must then regard Christianity as consisting in the fact of the incarnation of the eternal Logos : it is a miracle in the strictest sense, and absolutely. The human is lost in the divine, the natural in the supernatural. Whenever the first three gospels disagree with the fourth, the authority of the latter must be held to be decisive. This, however, amounts to a complete abandonment of all historical treatment of the gospel history. The history is so determined and absorbed by the element of miracle, as nowhere to afford any firm footing for the scientific inquirer. And more than this : to uphold the claim of the absolute miracle of the one gospel, the historical credibility of the other three is brought down to so low a level that they virtually forfeit their position as historical sources. The only way of escape from all these difficulties is to admit the conviction that the gospel of John stands in quite a different relation to the Synoptics from that which is generally assumed. Whether we look to its differences from the Synoptics, or to its general spirit and character, we see that it is impossible to allow to such a gospel as the Johannine the character of a historical narrative, even in the limited sense in which the Synoptics can be called historical. When the different accounts disagree we shall accordingly take our stand on the side of the Synoptics. In this way we escape the consequences which follow inevitably when John is placed on the same level with the Synoptics ; namely, that difficulties and objections are raised on each side, and with equal right, and the whole gospel narrative brought into suspicion. We now obtain a firmer historical basis. But even here we are warned by criticism that the ground on which a trustworthy history can be constructed is narrower than we thought. Recent investigations into the relations of the gospels to one another show us that the Synoptics cannot simply be placed side by side as of equal value. The gospel of Mark is so largely indebted to the other two that we cannot

regard it as an independent source at all.¹ The gospel of Luke is coloured by the Paulinism of its author, and cannot be regarded as an impartial narrative. We are thus thrown back on the gospel of Matthew as comparatively the 'most original and trustworthy source of the Evangelical history.

An examination of the contents of this Gospel shows us that there are two distinct elements present in it: the doctrine, and the purely historical narrative. The early tradition about Matthew states that he wrote down the *λόγια*, the sayings and discourses of Jesus, for the Hebrews, and in the Hebrew language. Now the Greek Gospel of Matthew which we have answers to this description. The great bulk of its contents, the body of the work, consists of the discourses and sayings of Jesus. His public ministry opens very significantly with the Sermon on the Mount. We may justly conclude from this that the author's original and leading idea was to treat the life and the whole manifestation of Jesus from this point of view. There is another narrative which deals largely in the discourses of Jesus. The discourses of John's Gospel, however, turn as well as the rest of that work on the person of Jesus and his superhuman dignity, as the theme which they all help to illustrate. Such is not the case here. The whole scope and spirit of the Gospel are different. What the discourses of this Gospel present to us is the human and familiar element of Christ's teaching, the direct appeal to the moral and religious consciousness, the simple answer to the question which naturally came up first of all—in what state of mind he must be, and what he must do, who would enter into the kingdom of God. We do not mean to deny that the gospel of Matthew also ascribes its full significance to the person of Jesus. Even in the Sermon on the Mount there are some hints of such a doctrine. But in the thought and imagery of the Sermon on the Mount the personal element remains as it were in the background of the scene; the discourse does not derive its importance from the person; it is

¹ Cf. my work: *das Markus-evangelium nach seinem Ursprung und Character*; Tüb. 1851. *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 54, *sq.* Köstlin, *op. cit.* p. 310, *sq.*

rather the profound and weighty discourse that reveals to us the true character and greatness of the speaker. It is the thing itself that speaks here; it is the inner force of truth making its way straight to men's hearts, which here announces itself in all its significance for the history of the world.

Now what does this direct and original element, this principle of Christianity, consist in, as we find it expressed both in the Sermon on the Mount, and in the parables, and in the whole of the doctrinal contents of the Gospel of Matthew? It may be shortly summed up under the following heads:—

It is in the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount that we obtain the deepest and most comprehensive insight into the fundamental way of looking at things, the fundamental mood, out of which Christianity proceeded. What is it that finds expression in all those utterances in which blessedness is said to belong to the poor in spirit, to those who mourn, to the meek, to those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, to the pure in heart, to the peacemakers, to those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake? It is religious consciousness which is penetrated by the deepest sense of the pressure of the finite and of all the contradictions of the present, and yet is infinitely exalted, and knows itself, in spite of this, to be far superior to everything finite and limited. The most pregnant expression for this, the original Christian consciousness, is the poverty of the poor in spirit. They are rightly placed at the head of all the different classes who are called blessed.¹

But the poor here spoken of must not be taken to be, as the ordinary interpretation has it, merely those who feel themselves inwardly poor and empty from a sense of their spiritual needs. We shall have an inadequate idea of what this poverty denotes if we do not take outward bodily poverty as an essential part of the conception. We are not at liberty to overlook this feature of it, since, in the first place, the parallel passage in Luke (vi. 20) gives us not the *πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι* of Matthew, but

¹ Cf. my *Kritische Untersuchungen*, p. 447, sq.

simply *πτωχοὶ*; and in the second place, the history of the Gospel shows us that it found its first adherents almost exclusively among the poor. This being so, we see that this poverty of spirit is a poverty which, when looked at in a spiritual way, is exactly the opposite of what it appears to be outwardly. Since these poor ones accept their poverty gladly and voluntarily, and of their own free-will elect to be just what they are, their poverty becomes to them a sign and evidence that, though outwardly poor, they are not poor in reality. Here they are the poor and those that have nothing; but there they are all the more certain to be the opposite of what they are here. They are the poor who have nothing, and yet possess all things. They have nothing, since their bodily poverty consists in having none of the goods that go to make property in this world; and what they may regard as their possession in the world to come is for them a thing entirely in the future. They having nothing, they live and move in an atmosphere of longing and desire for that which they have not; but, in this longing and desire, they virtually possess that to which their yearning and desire are going forth. Their having nothing makes them to be those who have all things; their poverty is their riches; the kingdom of heaven is even now their sure and peculiar possession, because as surely as they have nothing here, so surely they have all things there. In this contrast of having and not having, poverty and riches, earth and heaven, the present and the future, the Christian consciousness attains its purest ideality; it is the ideal unity of all the contradictions which force themselves upon the consciousness, as long as it confines itself to visible objects. All that the most developed dogmatic consciousness can comprise is already present here; and yet the whole significance of the early Christian idea consists in the fact that it has not ceased to be the immediate unity of all antitheses. All the beatitudes, variously as they sound, are but different expressions of the same original idea and mood which lie at the root of the Christian consciousness. What they express is the simple feeling of the need of redemption, which contains in itself implicitly,

though as yet undeveloped, the antithesis of sin and grace, and is its own sufficient evidence of the reality of the redemption which it longs for. It is because all antitheses are here held together in their unity that this original Christian consciousness is so vigorous and rich in thought. It is not only a deep and intense self-consciousness; it is also a lofty and commanding world-consciousness. We see this from the words which Jesus uses immediately after the beatitudes, where He calls his disciples the salt of the earth, which must never lose its savour if the world is not to be deprived of the power which, in deed and truth, holds it together, and preserves it from decay; and the light of the world which must not be set under a bushel, but must shine before the whole world, that men may see the good works of those who let their light shine, and may glorify their Father which is in heaven.

The beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount express, in an absolute manner, what constitutes the inmost self-consciousness of the Christian, as it is in itself, and apart from external relations. The original and radical element of Christianity appears further in the form of absolute moral command in the controversial part of the discourse which is directed against the Pharisees, and in other parts of it. In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus insists emphatically on purity and singleness of heart, on a morality which does not consist merely in the outward act, but in the inner disposition; and upon such an earnest and moral observance of the law as can admit of no arbitrary exception or limitation, nor tolerate any false hypocritical pretences, or any dividedness or want of singleness of heart. Here, however, the question may arise whether this principle be new or peculiar to Christianity. Jesus declared at the outset that he was not come to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them, and might thus appear to have taken up an entirely affirmative position towards the Old Testament. It might be said¹ that the difference

¹ Cf. Ritschl, *die Entstehung der alt-katholischen Kirche*, Bonn 1850, p. 27, *sq.* Ritschl changed his views in the second edition, but this fact does not invalidate

between the teaching of Jesus and the law, or the Old Testament, is one not of quality, but of quantity. On this view no new principle is advanced in his teaching; all that is done is to widen the application of the moral precepts which the law contained, and assert their authority over the whole extent of the moral sphere to which they are capable of referring. That is given back to the law which should never have been taken away from it. The law is declared to be capable of expansion in its meaning and its range of application, and this is said to be done. This interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount appeals to the fact, that in the further discussion of the subject, individual injunctions of the law are taken up, and each of them brought back to the original meaning of the law, or interpreted in a sense which satisfies the moral consciousness. But though there is no enunciation of a general principle which is to apply to all cases alike, yet when we consider what is said to be the true fulfilling of the law in each separate instance, and see how in each instance what is done is to contrast the outward with the inward, to disregard the mere act as such, and lay stress on the disposition as that which alone confers any moral value on a man's acts, we cannot but recognise in this a new principle, and one which differs essentially from Mosaism. What the law contained, it is true, but only implicitly, is now said to be of most importance, and enunciated as the principle of morality. The expansion of the law quantitatively amounts to a qualitative difference. The inner is opposed to the outer, the disposition to the act, the spirit to the letter. This is the essential root-principle of Christianity; and, in insisting that the absolute moral value of a man depends simply and solely on his disposition, Christianity was essentially original.

In this way the affirmative relation which Jesus assumed towards the law involves in itself the opposite relation of antithesis to the law. If this be so, it is certainly difficult to the accuracy of the position described in the text as one which has been and may be held.

understand how Jesus could say that not the least jot of the law, not one of its least commandments, should be taken away. How could he say this, when the very opposite came about so soon afterwards, and the whole law was declared to be abolished? How can we imagine him to have affirmed the permanent validity of all the injunctions of the law, when we think, for example, of the one injunction of circumcision? It is impossible to think that Jesus was so little aware of the principle and spirit of his own teaching as this would indicate; and the only choice left to us is, either to suppose him to have spoken exclusively of the moral law, and not to have had the ceremonial law before his mind at all, or to suppose that it was only later that his words received their strong Judaistic colouring. But it was not only to the Old Testament that Jesus took up as affirmative as possible an attitude. Even with respect to the traditions of the Pharisees, and their additions to the law, he did not carry his opposition to the point of encouraging open disregard of them. He paid no heed, it is true, to their exaggerations; against these he asserted what was reasonable in itself, as having indefeasible and incontrovertible authority. This was his position with regard to the acts which were impugned as breaches of the Sabbath law, Matt. xii. 1-14, and in defending himself against the charges of opponents, as at Matt. ix. 11; xv. 1. Yet he recognised the Pharisees as the legitimate successors of Moses. It is they and the Scribes, he says, who sit in the cathedra of Moses, the seat of the teacher and legislator, and the people are bound to follow their precepts, if not their example. Nor does he reject out and out even the pettiest regulations which the scrupulous spirit of Pharisaism had devised for the keeping of the law, Matt. xxiii. 1, *sq.*, 23. It is none the less true, however, that he declares their requirements to be heavy and intolerable burdens, a mode of expression which shows that he would not have allowed the oppression under which the people suffered to continue, Matt. xxiii. 3. He also said, when speaking against the Pharisees, that every plant which his heavenly Father had not planted should be rooted up.

Matt. xv. 13. And his actions were in a great measure directed to this end. One of his chief tasks was to contend against the influence and tendencies of Pharisaism as often as any occasion for doing so arose. This shows how wide the difference really was, and enables us to understand how Jesus could feel that it was unnecessary for him to set forth the antagonism of principle expressly, in all its length and breadth, or to show what it led to, and could be sure that, as the spirit of his teaching came to be understood and realised, it would be worked out to all the results which it necessarily involved. That he himself was thoroughly aware not only of the antagonism of principle, but of the consequences to which it could not fail to lead, appears very distinctly in the saying, Matt. ix. 16, where he not only declares the spirit of the new teaching to be incompatible with that of the old, but also intimates that though he himself had held as far as possible to the old traditional forms, thus putting the new wine into the old bottles, he had done this with a distinct consciousness that the new contents would soon break up the old form. But what was there in the new principle to make it break through the old forms, and supersede all that had gone before? What but its going back to the inward disposition, to that in the consciousness of man which declares itself as its self-existent and absolute contents. As the disposition is to be pure and simple, free from all self-seeking; and as it only is the root from which the fruit of good can spring, so man's consciousness is to be directed to that alone which it recognises as its absolute contents. This is the fundamental idea which runs through the whole of the Sermon on the Mount. The sayings in it which strike us as most significant are, when we examine them, just those which express most directly this absolute character of the Christian consciousness. This consciousness rejects—so the sayings at Matt. vi. 19-24 require—all half-heartedness and dividedness, all sense of separation and limitation; and in the light of it alone does the requirement at vii. 12, in which so many have looked for the root of Christian morality, receive its meaning as a principle. If the Christian is

conscious of his absolute standpoint, he must be able to abstract from himself, from his own ego, and to know himself as so much one with all others, that he regards each other man as one who possesses equal rights with himself. And this is what Jesus means when he says of the requirement we are speaking of, that it is the law and the prophets, or equivalent to the Old Testament command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." He who loves his neighbour as himself must renounce everything egotistical, subjective, or peculiar to himself; above the plurality of separate subjects, each of whom now is the same as we are, there comes to stand the objective universal, where everything particular and subjective is done away. This universal is that form of action in accordance with which we do to others what we wish that others should do to us. The morally good is thus that which is equally right and good for all, or which can be the object of action for all alike. Here then we meet again the characteristic feature of the Christian principle. It looks beyond the outward, the accidental, the particular, and rises to the universal, the unconditioned, the essential. It places a man's moral value only in that region of his life where he is in the presence of absolute considerations, and his acts possess absolute value. The same energy of consciousness which refuses to find the substantial essence of morality anywhere but in the inmost core of the disposition, asserts itself in the demand to do away with the individual ego by raising it up to the universal ego, the general self, that humanity which is present and is identical with itself in every separate individual. All the difference between this requirement and the commandment of Christ is, that in the latter the former appears in its simplest and most practical expression.

Thus do the absolute contents of the Christian principle find their expression in the moral consciousness. What gives a man his highest moral value is simply the purity of a disposition which is genuinely moral, and rises above all that is finite, particular, or merely subjective. Now, this morality of disposition is also the determining standard of man's relation to God. That which gives

him his highest moral value also places him in the adequate relation to God which answers to the idea of God. When man is regarded in his relation to God, the supreme task of the moral consciousness appears in the requirement to be perfect as God is perfect (Matt. v. 48). In this requirement the absolute nature of the Christian principle comes to its most direct expression. Christianity has no other standard for the perfection of man than the absolute standard of the perfection of God. If man is perfect as God is perfect, then, in this absolute perfection, he stands in that adequate relation to God which is expressed by the notion of righteousness. Righteousness in this sense is the absolute condition for entering into the kingdom of God. In the connection in which righteousness is spoken of in the Sermon on the Mount, it can mean nothing but the perfect fulfilment of the law; a fulfilment of the law, however, in that sense only in which Jesus considers the law to possess permanent validity. If it be asked how man can attain this righteousness, we find it to be a peculiarity of the teaching of Jesus, that it simply takes for granted that the law can be fulfilled, and the will of God done on earth as it is in heaven, so as to attain that righteousness which places man in his adequate relation to God. It appears, however, that a forgiveness of sins on God's part, by which the shortcomings in man's conduct may be balanced and made good, is an essential element of this adequate relation; for in the Lord's Prayer the forgiveness of sins is the object of a separate petition. Man must have his faults and sins forgiven, else he cannot enter into the relation which God's will requires. And as the doctrine of Jesus is led by its fundamental principle to estimate a man's whole position as a moral being, not by what he does outwardly, but by what he is in his heart, it can place this righteousness, in which consists the adequate relation of man to the will of God, nowhere but in his inner disposition. Man has this righteousness when he comes into such a frame of mind that he entirely renounces his own will, and devotes himself unreservedly to the will of God. This is worked out in the doctrine of the kingdom of God, which is to be found principally in the

The first part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It is essential for the business to have a clear and concise record of all income and expenses. This will allow the business to track its financial performance over time and identify areas for improvement. The second part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all assets and liabilities. This will allow the business to track its net worth over time and identify areas for improvement. The third part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all taxes paid. This will allow the business to track its tax liability over time and identify areas for improvement. The fourth part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all debts. This will allow the business to track its debt liability over time and identify areas for improvement. The fifth part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all equity. This will allow the business to track its equity over time and identify areas for improvement. The sixth part of the paper discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all other financial information. This will allow the business to track its overall financial performance over time and identify areas for improvement.

parables. In the kingdom of God the will of God is, in the first place, what every individual feels himself required, with the force of an absolute command, to fulfil; and, in the second place, the common task of a certain definite association. All the members of this association are to co-operate to realise the object which the will of God sets before them, and the more closely they are united with each other the more will that object be realised among them. The social element, which is an essential part of religion, is also the leading and essential feature of the kingdom of God. In the doctrine of Jesus we find the Old Testament notion of the theocracy in a spiritualised form; the relation of man to the kingdom of God is based upon none but moral conditions. So exclusively do moral considerations here prevail, that we hear nothing whatever of any of those external means which afterwards came to be considered as the doors which alone could give admission to the kingdom of God or to communion with him. It is taken for granted here that a man's partaking of all the blessings of God's kingdom depends simply on himself, on his own choice, on his own susceptibility to moral influences. How clearly and vividly is this simple truth presented to us in the parable of the sower! What makes a man fit for the kingdom of God is the Word, a term which comprises all those doctrines and precepts, by attending to which a man comes to realise the will of God. The Word is given to man; he can hear and understand it, but everything depends on the reception which he accords to it. And on this point what does ordinary experience show? That as the scattered seed cannot spring up nor bear fruit unless it fall on soil that is suited for it, so men are very differently constituted in respect of their capacity to receive the Word of God. There may be few who receive the Word in a right spirit; yet it is the fault of man himself if the Word does not produce in him all the effects which, for its own part, it is capable of producing. The reason lies simply in the want of a disposition to receive the Word, and this can only be corrected by man's own will. Nothing else is necessary than his will; so simple is man's relation to God. Whether or not he will enter

into the kingdom of God depends entirely on himself, on his own will, on his own natural capacity and readiness to receive. This being so, the whole relation of man to the kingdom of God can only be conceived as a moral one; and it is of the first importance that man should recognise this, and not think that any but purely moral conditions can avail to admit him to a part in the kingdom of God. The first requirement, then, which is made upon him is that he renounce every pretension on which he might rely as giving him an outward claim upon God's kingdom—that he should simply go back into himself, and seek nowhere but in himself, in his inner nature, in his moral consciousness, the evidence of his fitness for the kingdom of God. If he thus renounces everything that might place him in a merely external relation to God's kingdom, and takes up this humble and unpretending attitude towards it, which he cannot but assume when he retires simply into his own soul, then he will be fit for the kingdom. His fitness will consist in this, and this alone, that he is entirely receptive for what the kingdom has to give him. This is the meaning of the words in which Jesus deals with pretensions, such as the ideas the Jews held about the kingdom of God frequently led them to put forth—Matt. xviii. 3: "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of God." To become like a little child is to cease wishing to be independent, and to remain in that purely natural relation out of which the sense of dependence and need at once arises. The less a man has in himself that which he ought to have, the purer is the longing for that which only the kingdom of God can give, and the more surely will the kingdom of God be recognised as possessing transcendent and absolute value. This truth is symbolised in the parable of the pearl, for the sake of which the merchant parts with all his other property, Matt. xiii. 45, *sq.* There can be no doubt that the parables which deal with the attitude men take towards the kingdom of God, and which set forth the moral conditions of participation in it, are, together with the Sermon on the Mount, the most genuine and original remains which have come down to us of the teaching of Jesus.

If the ideas on which we have been enlarging are the earliest and most essential element of the teaching of Jesus, it appears to be purely and entirely moral in its tendency, and what it aims at is simply to throw men back on their own moral and religious consciousness. A man has only to become clearly aware of that which announces itself in his own consciousness as his highest moral end, and he can realise it by his own efforts. When we thus look back to its earliest elements, Christianity appears as a purely moral religion; its highest and most peculiar distinction is that it bears an essentially moral character, and is rooted in the moral consciousness of man. The Gospel of John insists on faith in the person of Jesus as the indispensable condition of the new relation with God to which man is introduced by Jesus; faith in the person of Jesus is there the first and most essential requirement of the gospel. In the original Christian doctrine no such requirement is put forward. There are other elements which belong to the character and the contents of Christianity, and the relation which these bear to its original and simple beginnings may be variously determined; but there can be no question that the purely moral element which lies at its first source has ever been its unchangeable and substantial foundation. Christianity has never been removed from this foundation without denying its true and proper character. To this foundation it has always been forced to return as often as it went astray in that exaggerated dogmatism, whose logical conclusions were found to undermine the very foundations of moral and religious life. The element which appears at the outset with all the significance of far-reaching principles, which has always remained the same though other parts of the religion changed, and which contains in itself the evidence that it is true,—this surely must be held to be the proper substance of the whole.

And yet had Christianity been nothing more than such a doctrine of religion and morality as we have been describing, what would it have amounted to, and what would have come of it? True though it be, when we regard Christianity in this

aspect, that it comprised and summed up those pure and simple truths which utter themselves in man's moral and religious consciousness, and that it opened up these truths to the common mind in the plainest and most popular style, yet more than this was needed. A form was needed for the religious life to grow up in as a concrete structure. A firm centre was required, around which the circle of its disciples might rally, so as to grow into a fellowship which should be able to win dominion over the world. When we consider the way in which Christianity grew up, it is plain that it could have had no place nor significance in history but for the person of its Founder. How soon must all the true and weighty precepts of Christianity have been numbered with the faint echoes of words spoken by many a friend of humanity and philosophic sage of ancient times, had not its doctrines been made words of eternal life in the mouth of its Founder? But we cannot help asking, with regard to the person of Jesus, what is to be considered as the secret of the importance it has attained for the whole of the world's history? However powerful we may conceive his personal influence to have been, it must have acted from a certain point or fulcrum supplied by the circumstances of the place and time. Without this it could not have produced that effect on the mind of the age, which enabled the work and influence of an individual to set on foot a movement so extensive and profound, and exercising such an influence on the whole history of mankind. Here, then, is the point where Christianity and Judaism belong to each other so closely, that the former can only be understood in the light of its connection with the latter. To put it shortly: had not the Messianic idea, the idea in which Jewish national hopes had their profoundest expression, fixed itself on the person of Jesus, and caused him to be regarded as the Messiah who had come for the redemption of his people, and in whom the promise to the fathers was fulfilled, the belief in him could never have had a power of such far-reaching influence in history. It was in the Messianic idea that the spiritual contents of Christianity were clothed on with the concrete form in which it could enter on the

path of historical development. The consciousness of Jesus was thus taken up by the national consciousness, and enabled to spread and become the general consciousness of the world.

The Gospel history supplies us with abundance of evidence to show that, at the time of Jesus, the Messianic expectations had not only engaged the attention of pious souls here and there, but become a prominent feature in the belief of the people at large. As the political position under which the people was suffering at the time was flagrantly inconsistent with the theocratic idea which enters into the whole history of the Jewish race, men were led to gaze intensely into the past. There they discerned one point at least at which the theocratic ideal appeared to have been realised, though but for a short time. From that point downwards the history of their nation had been very different in fact from what it should have been. Yet they did not despair, but expected with all the greater confidence that the near or distant future would bring what the past had so long failed to realise,—that promise given to the fathers, which generation had long handed down to generation as the object of their yearning. It is an important and peculiar characteristic of Judaism that, by the constant and ever-widening contrast between the idea and the reality, and as the belief in the Messiah was a belief in one who was still to come, it came to be mainly a religion of the future. Thus no important movement could take place upon the soil of the history of the Jewish people and religion without either being introduced by the Messianic idea or becoming involved with it at a later stage. The way which Christianity had to take was thus foreshadowed. The synoptic account of the Gospel history brings Jesus before us accompanied by all the miracles which were to announce him to the world as the long-promised Messiah who had now appeared, and as the Son of God, according to the Jewish notion of that dignity.'

From the standpoint of historical criticism we can only ask how it came to be an established fact in Jesus' own mind that he was called to be the Messiah? There are three points in the

Gospel history which seem to offer light upon this point and deserve attention, the name of *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* which Jesus applies to himself; the group of narratives comprising the confession of Peter, the scene of the transfiguration, and the first announcement by Jesus of his approaching death; and his appearance in Jerusalem. The manner in which Jesus applies the name *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* to himself is so peculiar that whatever account of its precise meaning we accept, we must suppose him to have intended some reference to the Messianic idea when he used it.¹ Such a reference is, however, more evident in the second particular which we spoke of. If we follow the Gospel history up to the point where we find those narratives (which are not only placed together by the evangelists, but are intimately related to each other in matter and import), we see distinctly that a very important crisis has here been reached in the progress of Jesus' cause. Both he and his disciples have now arrived at the clear conviction that he is actually the Messiah.² It is certainly quite incomprehensible how this belief could still require further confirmation, when the Gospel history has already narrated a multitude of indisputable proofs of Jesus' Messiahship. This, however, only makes it the more remarkable, and for the historian the more gratifying, that even in such a narrative as that of the synoptics there should have been preserved the steps which led to a belief which was not yet at that time fully formed. The most unequivocal proof, however, of Jesus' belief in himself as the Messiah is furnished by his appearance at Jerusalem. Even had the triumphal entry been wanting, the significance of his going to Jerusalem remains. After his long and uninterrupted ministry in

¹ It is very doubtful if this expression was a current name for the Messiah at the time of Jesus. With regard to the use of it by him, the most likely explanation is that it indicated an antithesis to the Jewish *υἱὸς θεοῦ*, and the ideas associated with that title, and an emphatic assertion of the truly human character of Jesus' coming and vocation. Cf. Baur die Bedeutung des Ausdrucks *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, in Hülgenfeld's Zeitschr. für histor. Theol. 1860, 3, p. 274).

² Cf. Theolog. Jahrbücher, 1853, p. 77, *sq.*

Galilee,¹ and after all the experience he had gained of the acceptance of his doctrine among the people and the opposition made to it by his adversaries with whom he had already come in contact, he comes to the resolution to leave Galilee and go to Judea, to appear in the capital itself, at the seat of those rulers, against whose whole system and traditions his ministry up to that time had been the most distinct and outspoken protest. Such a momentous step can only have proceeded from the conviction that it was absolutely necessary for his cause, now ripe for decision, to be at once decided. The time had come for his doctrine and person to be either accepted or rejected; the whole nation must be called on to declare whether it would persist in that traditional Messianic belief which bore the stamp of selfish Jewish particularism, or if it would accept such a Messiah as he was, and had shown himself in his whole life and influence to be. This was the question which could receive no answer but one; the answer to which he had long ago made up his mind with all the calmness of assured conviction.

Never was that which bore the outward appearance of ruin and annihilation turned into such signal and decisive victory and so glorious a passage into life, as in the death of Jesus. Up to this time there was always a possibility that he and the people might come to agree on the ground of the Messianic faith: the people might acknowledge him to be the person to whose advent the national expectations pointed; the disagreement between his idea of the Messiah and the Jewish Messianic faith might still

¹ The duration of the Galilean ministry is one of the many unsettled points in a life of the outward outlines of which we know so little. The usual assumption that it continued for three years has no other basis but the number of the festival journeys mentioned in John, and this depends on the way in which the Johannine question is settled. The great weight of the tradition of the early church is to the effect that Jesus taught only one year. This one year, however, is the *ἐνιαυτός κυρίου δεκτός* of the prophet Isaiah lxi. 2, cf. Luke iv. 19, and is doubtless nothing more than a dogmatic assumption. It is not in itself probable that the public ministry of Jesus extended over so short a period. Compare Hilgenfeld *die elementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien*, 1848, p. 160, *sq.* Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justins', 1850, p. 337. My Kritische Unters. über die Kanon. Evang., p. 363, *sq.*

be peaceably adjusted. But his death made a complete and irreparable breach between him and Judaism. A death like his made it impossible for the Jew, as long as he remained a Jew, to believe in him as his Messiah. To believe in him as the Messiah after his dying such a death involved the removal from the conception of the Messiah of all the Jewish and carnal elements which were associated with it. A Messiah who died, and by his death put an end to all that the Jew expected his Messiah to accomplish—a Messiah who had died to the life in the flesh—was no longer a *Χριστὸς κατὰ σάρκα* (2 Cor. v. 16) such as the Messiah of the Jewish national faith was. Even to the most faithful adherent of the cause of Jesus, what could a Messiah be who had fallen a prey to death? Only two alternatives were possible: either with his death the faith which had gathered round him must be extinguished, or this faith, if it were firm and strong enough, must break through the barrier of death itself, and force its way from death to life. Nothing but the miracle of the resurrection could disperse these doubts which threatened to drive away the faith of the disciples after its object into the eternal night of death. The question as to the nature and the reality of the resurrection lies outside the sphere of historical inquiry. History must be content with the simple fact, that in the faith of the disciples the resurrection of Jesus came to be regarded as a solid and unquestionable fact. It was in this faith that Christianity acquired a firm basis for its historical development. What history requires as the necessary antecedent of all that is to follow, is not so much the fact of the resurrection of Jesus, as the belief that it was a fact. The view we take of the resurrection is of minor importance for the history. We may regard it as an outward objective miracle, or as a subjective psychological miracle; since, though we assume that an inward spiritual process was possible by which the unbelief of the disciples at the time of the death of Jesus was changed into belief in his resurrection, still no psychological analysis can show what that process was. In any case it is only through the consciousness of

the disciples that we have any knowledge of that which was the object of their faith; and thus we cannot go further than to say that by whatever means this result was brought about, the resurrection of Jesus became a fact of their consciousness, and was as real to them as any historical event.

Great, however, as was the importance of this fact, and certain as it seemed to bring the minds of the disciples who believed in Jesus into direct conflict with Judaism, the idea was still too narrow to accomplish much. Had the belief in the risen one continued to be what it was at first, that he had passed from death to life and risen from earth to heaven, to return after a short interval, the same as he had been before, only seated on the clouds of heaven and clothed with all the power and majesty that belonged to the Son of man, to realise at last what his early and violent death had left unaccomplished,—had the belief not risen above this form, what could it have achieved? As the first disciples conceived that the very next step after the departure of the Lord from the earth was to be his second coming which was to be the consummation of the whole of the world's history, their faith in the risen one was simply a new and stronger form of the old Messianic expectations. Had no new development taken place, the only difference between the believing disciples and their unbelieving fellow-countrymen would have been that to the former the Messiah would have been one who had come already, and to the latter one who was still to come. The Christian faith would have become the faith of a mere Jewish sect, in whose keeping the whole future of Christianity would have been imperilled. What was it then that invested the belief in the risen one with a higher significance, and made it possible for the principle which had entered into the world in Christianity to develop itself in the great and imposing series of phenomena in which its history was unfolded, and to triumph over every influence which opposed it and threatened to hinder or obscure the all-commanding universalism of its spirit and aims?

PART SECOND.

CHRISTIANITY AS A UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLE OF SALVATION: THE CONFLICT BETWEEN PAULINISM AND JUDAISM, AND ITS ADJUSTMENT IN THE IDEA OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I.—THE CONFLICT.

It is a proof of the strong faith of the disciples, and of the great confidence they had already gained in the cause of Jesus, that during the period immediately succeeding his death they neither dispersed about the country nor agreed to meet at any more distant spot, but made Jerusalem itself their permanent centre. Here it was that the first Christian church was formed, and the Church of Jerusalem continued to be regarded by all Jewish believers in Jesus as the headquarters of their religion. Recent critical investigations show that the statements given in the Acts of the Apostles afford but a dim and confused picture of this early community of believers, and yield little to the historian in the way of trustworthy or consistent materials. It is not till we come to the appearance of Stephen and the persecution of which he was the occasion (Chap. vi. and vii.) that we stand on firmer historical ground. Here there are two things to be remarked. The charge brought against Stephen, which is strikingly similar to that brought against Jesus at his trial, and cannot in the latter case any more than that of Stephen have been an entirely baseless statement on the part of the false witnesses, shows us the early beginnings of an opposition which could only find its further development in Paulinism. The more spiritual worship of God which Stephen

opposed to the externalism of the existing temple worship, could not fail to lead beyond Judaism. The whole appearance of Stephen suggests that the cause he pleaded was one which would justify us in calling him the forerunner of the apostle Paul. It is important, however, to notice, that this opposition to Judaism to which Stephen was the first to draw public attention, seems to have existed in the Church of Jerusalem for some time, and to have divided the church into two different parties. Stephen was a Hellenist, and it cannot be thought accidental that this more liberal tendency appeared in one who was a Hellenist. The fact of which he is an example, that the primitive church at Jerusalem numbered Hellenists among its members, is confirmed by the express statement of the Acts (viii. 4, xi. 19, *sq.*) When the members of the Church fled from the persecution to which Stephen fell a martyr, and were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, not only did these fugitives carry Christianity to Samaria, to the towns of the sea-coast, and even to Cyprus and Antioch, but at Antioch some of them, men from Cyprus and Cyrene, and of course Hellenists, took the important step in advance of preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles. Antioch thus became the seat of the first church of Gentile Christians, as Jerusalem was the mother church of the Jewish Christians. It is stated in the Acts (viii. 1) that only the apostles stayed in Jerusalem at this persecution; but this is improbable. If we may judge from the occasion out of which it arose, this persecution was not aimed at the Church as a whole, but rather at the Hellenists who sympathised with Stephen in his more liberal views and his consequent hostility to Judaism. Thus the history of Stephen affords clear evidence to show that the Church of Jerusalem had all along consisted of two parties, the Hebraists and the Hellenists, who now effected a complete separation from each other. From this time forth the Church of Jerusalem consisted entirely of Hebraists. The Hellenists, however, were widely diffused even before this time; and though the more liberal tendency only found its first expression in Stephen, yet we cannot

be wrong in thinking that it had been at work before, and that it was due to its influence that Hellenism was already giving birth to Gentile Christianity. It was the apostle Paul, however, in whom Gentile Christianity found in the course of these same movements, of which the proto-martyr Stephen is the centre, its true herald, and logical founder and expositor.¹

The history of the development of Christianity dates of course from the departure of Jesus from the world. But in Paul this history has a new beginning; from this point we are able to trace it not only in its external features, but also in its inner connection.

What the Acts tell us of the conversion of the apostle can only be regarded as the outward reflection of an inner spiritual process. The explanation of this process is to be found in the apostle's own individuality as we have it set before us in his epistles. In speaking of the period immediately preceding the great turning-point of his life, he says that he was a great zealot for the traditions of the fathers, and that he went beyond many of his contemporaries in the Jewish religion. The reason of this must have been simply that he saw more clearly than many others how completely the new doctrine would undermine Judaism if it prevailed. The characteristic feature of Christianity appeared to him no doubt to be what the main charge brought against Stephen, and against Jesus himself, had indicated, namely, its refusal to regard true religion as a thing bound down to special ordinances and localities. This refusal naturally and at once impressed on the religious consciousness a tendency to detach itself from the ground of traditional Judaism. Thus it arose out of the natural logic of his character that as when a Jew he had thrown all the vigour of his intellect into the persecution of Christianity, so when converted to Christ he should become the most trenchant opponent of the very principle of Judaism. Accordingly the history of his conversion, as he himself gives it to us (Gal. i. 15, 16), presents us with the remarkable circumstance that the revelation in which God revealed his Son in him, and the

¹ Cf. Baur's *Paul, his Life and Works, his Epistles and his Doctrine*. T. T. F. L. Williams and Norgate, 1875-76.

call which he then received to preach the Gospel among the Gentiles, were to his mind one and the same spiritual act. He did not merely become a disciple of Jesus, like other converts to the Christian faith: the consciousness sprang up in him that he was an apostle of Christ such as the older apostles were; and yet quite different from them, since he felt that it was only in the Gentile world that his apostolic mission could be accomplished. Thus, not only was he the first to lay down expressly and distinctly the principle of Christian universalism as a thing essentially opposed to Jewish particularism. From the first he set this Christian principle before him as the sole standard and rule of his apostolic activity. In his Christian consciousness his own call to the apostolic office and the destination of Christianity to be the general principle of salvation for all people were two facts which were bound up inseparably in each other, and could not be disjoined. We cannot call his conversion, his sudden transformation from the most vehement opponent of Christianity into its boldest preacher, anything but a miracle; and the miracle appears all the greater when we remember that in this revulsion of his consciousness he broke through the barriers of Judaism and rose out of the particularism of Judaism into the universal idea of Christianity. Yet great as this miracle is, it can only be conceived as a spiritual process; and this implies that some step of transition was not wanting from the one extreme to the other. It is true that no analysis, either psychological or dialectical, can detect the inner secret of the act in which God revealed his Son in him. Yet it may very justly be asked whether what made the transition possible can have been anything else than the great impressiveness with which the great fact of the death of Jesus came all at once to stand before his soul. From the moment of the revelation in which the Son of God was revealed in him, he lives only in contemplation of the Crucified One: he knows no other, he is crucified with him, his whole system of thought turns on this one fact. The death which was to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness, for him contains and expresses all salvation, and that as no ideal

death, but in its most obvious and material aspect as a fact, as the death on the cross from which Christianity itself is named the word, the preaching of the cross. In what other way can he have overcome his hatred and repugnance towards Christianity but by being plunged, almost against his will, in a high-wrought and intense frame of spirit, into contemplation of this death? To the Jewish imagination a crucified Messiah was the most intolerable of ideas. His mind, however, accustomed as it was to deeper thinking, came to see that even what was most repugnant to man's natural feelings might yet prove to be the most profoundly and essentially true, and so the idea ceased to be intolerable. Death, he came to see, can be transfigured into life. A Messiah who has died in the flesh cannot indeed be a *Χριστὸς κατὰ σάρκα* in the sense of the Jewish national ideas. Yet all the more surely may he be discerned as one who has died to the flesh and been transfigured to a higher life and stands as a Redeemer high above all the limitations of Judaism. A death which ran so directly counter to all the facts and presuppositions of the Jewish national consciousness, could not be confined in its significance to the Jewish nation, it must have a scope far transcending the particularism of Judaism. There can be no doubt that this was the thought in which the apostle first discerned the truth of Christianity. It was certainly the thought which lay at the root of his view of the person of Christ, and from which the whole dialectical development of Pauline Christianity proceeded. Now the Christian universalism which thus became a certainty to the apostle before any other of the disciples had reached it implied from the first a much deeper breach with Judaism than we might have supposed. This is the only possible explanation of the fact, that from the time of his conversion the apostle Paul went his own independent way, and avoided intentionally and on principle all contact with the older apostles.¹ He made a short visit to

¹ Cf. the work of Dr. A. Holsten, *Inhalt und Gedankengang des Briefs an die Galater*, Rostock 1859, p. 4, sq., 17, sq. This work is markedly superior to ordinary commentaries in its logical precision, and its luminous development of the apostle's thought. See also Holsten on Galatians in the *Protestanten-Bibel*, Leipzig, 1872; p. 700, sqq.

Jerusalem, during which he was with Peter, but he leaves us without any clear information as to his intercourse with him beyond what may be gathered from the certainly significant expression that he only came there to make Peter's acquaintance. After this short visit he seemed to turn his back on Judaism for ever (Gal. i. 17-24).

But the apostle takes up an attitude of so great freedom and independence not only towards the older apostles, but towards the person of Jesus himself, that one might be inclined to ask whether a view of his relation to the person of Christ can be the right one which would make the apostle Paul the originator and first exponent of that which constitutes the essence of Christianity as distinguished from Judaism. Is there not too great a distance between the founder of Christianity and one who made his first appearance altogether outside the circle of the first apostles? The difficulty is great if we are to suppose that this apostle derived no assistance from the original apostles, but did of himself what no one had done before,—introduced Christianity to its true destination as a religion for the world, and enunciated, with a full sense of its vast significance, the principle of Christian universalism. Here, however, we shall do well to attend to the two elements which we find in the person of Jesus, and to their relation to each other. First, there was the moral universal in him, the unconfined humanity, the divine exaltation, which gave his person its absolute significance. On the other side there was the cramping and narrowing influence of the Jewish national Messianic idea. The latter was the form which the person of Jesus was obliged to assume if the former element was to have a point of vantage from which to go forth into the stream of history, and to find the way on which it could pass into the general consciousness of mankind. What, then, could be more natural than that one set of his followers should hold to the national side of his appearance, and attach themselves to it so firmly as never to surmount the particularism of Judaism at all, while the other of the two elements, which in the person of Jesus were combined in a simple unity, found in another quarter a much more distinct and energetic expression than the first set of his followers

ever could have given it? ¹ In this way the natural starting-point of each party is found in the life and work of the founder. The only question comes to be how the apostle Paul appears in his Epistles to be so indifferent to the historical facts of the life of Jesus. He seldom appeals to any traditions on the subject, though his apostolic activity, as well as that of the other apostles, would have been meaningless without them. He bears himself but little like a disciple who has received the doctrines and the principles which he preaches from the Master whose name he bears. But this only shows us how large and how spiritual his conception of Christianity was. The special and particular vanish for him in the contemplation of the whole. Christianity stands before him as a great historical fact which can be understood and grasped only in its unity and its immediateness as a divine revelation. The great facts of the death and resurrection of Jesus make it what it is. Around these facts his whole Christian consciousness revolves; his whole Christian consciousness is transformed into a view of the person of Jesus which stands in need of no history to elucidate it. Why should he go to eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses of Christ's life to ask what he was according to the flesh, when he has seen himself in the spirit? Why should he ask whether what he is teaching agrees with the original teaching of Jesus, and with the discourses and sayings which have been handed down from him, when in the Christ who lives and works in him he hears the voice of the Lord himself? Why should he draw from the past what the Christ who is present in him has made to be the direct utterance of his own consciousness? ²

¹ Cf. my work, *Die Tübinger Schule*, 1859, p. 30, *sq.*

² Nothing could be more paltry than the attempts some scholars have made to fill up the supposed gap in the evidence of the apostle's legitimation. This is done by collecting from his works as many quotations as possible of the words of Jesus. It is also asserted that the confidence the apostle expresses that he had not run in vain must mean that he had an accurate acquaintance with the teaching of the historical Christ. Otherwise, it is said, he must have been proclaiming himself as a second and better Christ, a sort of Montanist Paraclete. See Paret, *Jesus und Paulus. Einige Bemerkungen über das Verhältniss des Apostels Paulus und seiner Lehre zu der Person, dem Leben und der Lehre des*

Fourteen years had passed since the apostle's conversion; he had entered into his sphere of apostolic activity, had planted churches of Gentile Christians, and founded at Antioch a metropolis for the whole body of Gentile Christian believers, when a question which it appears had never yet been stirred, and with regard to which Jesus had had no occasion to declare himself, all at once rose into the most serious practical importance. Up to this time Paul and his apostolic fellow-labourers had not scrupled to invite the Gentiles to the Gospel. Nor had they thought of making it a condition of their participating in the Messianic blessings that they should submit to circumcision, and in so doing become bound to observe the law. But as the number of converts from heathenism increased, and as the efforts of those who carried the Gospel to the Gentiles diffused it more and more widely throughout the Gentile world, the Christians of Jerusalem became alarmed. They could not look on with indifference, when they saw a Gentile Christian Church arising over-against the Church of Jerusalem in utter dis-

geschichtlichen Christus. Jahrb. d. deutschen Theol. 3, 1858, p. 1, sq. The attempt to make out quotations is very defective and unsatisfactory, and it is impossible to help thinking that had the apostle himself felt the need of such credentials for his teaching, he would have expressed himself quite differently in his epistles. Nor would it be easy to understand, on such a hypothesis, how at the very time at which it must have been his chief concern to gain as accurately as possible a knowledge of the teaching of Christ, he could maintain an attitude of such indifference towards the older apostles. The teaching of Jesus was to be found nearest its source with them, and if he wished to have the best and most trustworthy information on the subject he should have frequented their company. Now Gal. i. 11, sq., shows us distinctly that he recognised no obligations to the older apostles with regard to his gospel. He would have regarded their communications as a purely human medium, and could not have brought them into connection with the immediate ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ which had taken place in his own consciousness. From this we cannot but conclude that we should have a totally false notion of what his apostolic consciousness was if we supposed that he reached it by the processes on which our own historical information is dependent, and which render it so limited and so uncertain. We have only to consider what is involved in the claim he advanced to be not merely a disciple of Jesus, but an apostle, with the full autonomy of the apostolic authority. Compare the discussions (which the author of the above-named dissertation has left quite unnoticed) which I gave in my contributions to the explanation of the Epistle to the Corinthians, on the apostle's principle of authority. Theol. Jahrb. 1852, p. 32, sq., and on the ecstasies of the apostle, 1850, p. 182, sq.

regard of the ordinances and privileges of Judaism, and yet putting forth a claim to equal place and dignity with themselves. Members of the Church of Jerusalem came to Antioch, as the apostle himself tells us (Gal. ii. 1, sq.) He calls them false brethren, intruders, who jealously spied out the liberty that was enjoyed and claimed as a Christian right at Antioch, and made it their aim to bring the Christians there into bondage under the law. The matter appeared so important to the apostle that he felt he must himself go to Jerusalem¹ and have the question discussed on the spot where it had arisen, and where alone it could be decided. The direct practical issue of the question which had been raised was whether or not Gentile Christians required to be circumcised. The apostle therefore took with him not only Barnabas but also Titus, an uncircumcised Gentile Christian, that there might be a case before the Church at Jerusalem, in which the strength of the resistance to the demand that had been made there might be visibly demonstrated. But who were the opponents to whom Paul and Barnabas had to offer so strenuous a resistance? Who else than the elder apostles themselves? We should have a strange conception of the Church at Jerusalem and the position the apostles occupied in it, if we thought that a question of such importance as this could arise in it, and that the apostles took no part in the discussion, the originators of the dispute being merely certain extreme Judaists, with whose assertions and demands the apostles themselves did not agree. Had such been the case, how easy would it have been to arrive at an understanding! This view is clearly contrary, not only to the nature of the case, but to the plain meaning of the apostle's own words. It has often been repeated,² but it can never amount to anything more than an un-

¹ Ἀνέβην κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, says the apostle, Gal. ii. 2. Here we see very distinctly into the psychological background of such ἀποκαλύψεις, in which Christ himself appeared to him.

² A principal authority for this view, which is so totally opposed to sound historical insight, is Lechler's Prize Essay, which was crowned by the Teyler Theological Society, Das apostolische und nachapostolische Zeitalter mit Rücksicht auf Unterschied und Einheit zwischen Paulus und den übrigen aposteln, zwischen Heidenchristen und Judenchristen. Haarlem, 1851. In the second and revised

warrantable claim to set aside the original account, which bears the direct impress of the facts as they occurred, and to set above it a narrative which is inconsistent with it, and is manifestly governed by the writer's desire to give a new version of what had occurred.¹ We need only consider the phrases which Paul selects to describe his opponents, and which are carefully designed to indicate only their own view of the position which they held. He calls them *οἱ δοκοῦντες*, *δοκοῦντες εἶναι τι*, *οἱ δοκοῦντες στυλοὶ εἶναι*, thus showing us that the older apostles themselves were the authorities for the view with which he had to contend. Then we may remember how deliberately and with how full a sense of the independence of his own position he confronted the apostle Peter himself (ii. 7, *sq.*), and lastly, what the result of the whole conference was. The three principal representatives of the Church of Jerusalem did indeed give to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, but the agreement which was arrived at consisted simply in recognising that each party had a right to go his own way, separate from, and independent of the other. Thus there were now two Gospels, a Gospel of the circumcision and a Gospel of the uncircumcision, a mission to the Jews and a mission to the Gentiles. The two were to go on side by side, separate and independent, without crossing each other's paths. The only bond to

edition (Stuttgart 1857), Lechler has simply repeated his former assertion, as was to be expected; he has brought forward no better evidence or arguments in its support. Cf. Hilgenfeld, *der Galaterbrief übersetzt, in seinen geschichtlichen Beziehungen untersucht und erklärt* (1852), p. 128. *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* i. 1858, p. 54, *sq.* 317, *sq.* No recent writer has exposed the unPauline view of the passage with greater logic and acumen than Holsten, in the work mentioned, p. 48.

¹ This is one of the points where the question of the relation between the narrative in the Acts and the apostle's own statements is of most importance. On this subject there is nothing to be added to what will be found in my work on the apostle Paul and in Zeller's work on the Acts. Here if anywhere there is a conflict of principles, which cannot be carried further. The two views simply confront each other as the critical view and the uncritical. The former is based upon differences which lie actually before our eyes. The latter seeks, in the interests of the apostles, to adjust these differences. But the adjustment will only be satisfactory to those who can accept the implied assumption that the interests of the apostles constitute a standard of historical truth. See my Paul, his Life and Work, i. p. 105, *sqq.* Zeller, *Acts of the Apostles*, ii. p. 8, *sqq.*

connect the Gentile with the Jewish Christians was to be the care for the support of the poor of the parent Church. So decided an attitude of opposition did the two standpoints now assume: on the one side was the apostle Paul refusing with immovable firmness to be shaken even for a moment in any point which his principles required him to maintain, or to yield any compliance to the proposals addressed to him: on the other side were the older apostles clinging tenaciously to their Judaism. During the long period of years which had elapsed they had not made a single step that would have carried them beyond their Jewish particularism. They were still asserting the principle of the indispensableness of circumcision as a qualification for the Messianic community. They could not shut their eyes to the success which had attended the preaching of the Gospel to the heathen, nor deny, what the event had proved, that God's blessing rested on that enterprise. This, and the cogent arguments of the Pauline dialectic, left them without any reasonable objection to bring forward against the prosecution of the mission to the heathen. Yet the concession which they thus appeared to make did not arise from any root of conviction in their minds, and was out of harmony with their religious feelings. In fact the relations of the two parties to each other were now such that the line of demarcation which had been drawn between them could not possibly be long observed. This was proved to be the case in the encounter between Peter and Paul at Antioch, which took place soon after the right hand of fellowship had been given. On this occasion a very outspoken declaration of quite a different character was made. When Peter came to Antioch he at first ate with the Gentile Christians. But some persons came there from James, and by the mere fact of their presence reminded Peter so strongly of the principles which were so rigorously upheld at Jerusalem, that he gave up sitting at the same table with the Gentile Christians as he had hitherto been doing. In drawing this distinction between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians he practically declared that he no longer recognised the latter to be on the same level with the former. The apostle of the Gentiles felt

this double-faced conduct to be an attack upon his principles, and took up the matter so warmly that he confronted the chief of the older apostles with a very pointed remonstrance before the assembled church. The apostle Peter's action showed that the alternatives left open to Jewish Christians by the treaty of Jerusalem were either to do away with the distinction between Jewish and Gentile Christians altogether, or to continue to be Jews, and deny to the Gentile Christians any privilege which would place them on the same level with the Jewish Christians. The apostle Paul also took a step which could not fail to have further consequences. With incisive energy he pointed out to Peter how his inconsistent and halting Jewish Christian position, which sought to hold both faith and the law at once, was a logical as well as a moral blunder, a contradiction in which he stood self-condemned. He then went on to demonstrate his own position, and showed what the Christian principle led to, when followed out consistently. Though the law is taken away, Christ is not the minister of sin, and he, the apostle, instead of building up what he had himself destroyed, was through the law dead to the law, that he might live to God.¹ The words and the whole tone of the apostle bear witness how sharp the personal collision between him and Peter must have been, and we are not surprised to find that the scene at Antioch made a deep impression on the mind of the age, and left very lasting effects behind. Throughout all the Epistles of Paul we do not find the slightest indication that the apostles ever drew nearer to each other in after years. The Acts passes over the occurrence at Antioch with a resolute silence, which shows clearly enough how far what was remembered of the subject was from harmonising with the reconciling tendency of this work. From a work written in the second half of the second century, the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, we gather that even then the Jewish Christians had not yet learned to forgive the harsh word which the apostle Paul had spoken of the man whom they regarded as the chief of the apostles.²

¹ For the exegesis of the passage, Gal. ii. 15, *sq.*, cf. Holsten, *op. cit.* p. 22, *sq.*

² Hom. 17-19. Εἰ κατεγνωσμένον με λέγεις, Θεοῦ ἀποκαλύψαντός μοι τὸν Χριστὸν κατηγορεῖς, Peter says to Simon Magus, with an obvious allusion to the

We have seen that at the very outset of the controversy, as soon as the question of circumcision had arisen, men once and again appeared on the scene who had come from the Church at Jerusalem, and openly sought to bring about a reaction (Gal. ii. 4, 12). We meet with the same phenomenon in the Gentile Christian Churches planted by Paul. Judaists of the same stamp appeared in these churches, and made it their business to bring Pauline Christianity into discredit, and to destroy what the apostle had founded and built up as his own work, without the law and in opposition to the law, in order to rear it up again on the basis of the law. The first actual proof of this systematic opposition to the apostle Paul appears in the Epistle to the Galatians, which was occasioned by that very opposition. It was written a few years after the occurrence at Antioch, after the apostle had made his second missionary journey. The whole arrangement and tendency of the Epistle show that the apostle deemed the matter to be of great importance, and saw that his principles were at stake in the contest. He therefore thinks it necessary to give a circumstantial account of his whole relation to Christ and to the earlier apostles, from the time of his conversion onward. He simply narrates the facts, and in this way he considers that he furnishes an irresistible proof, that from the very outset he has asserted distinctly, and in various ways, the independent right of the Gospel which he preached, and that his claim has been allowed. The opponents who had taken the field against him in the Churches of Galatia were but a new detachment of the opposition with which he had had to contend before. They had perplexed the conscience of the Galatian Christians by asserting that the work of their salvation was built

words of Paul, Gal. ii. 10, *κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν.* The tradition of the church which brought the apostles together again places the final reconciliation of the two at the end of a long period of separation. Post tanta tempora, the *Predicatio Pauli* says in the passage which has been preserved in the treatise de Rebaptismate, appended to the works of Cyprian (Cypr. Opp. Ed. Baluz. p. 365, sq.) *Petrum et Paulum post conculationem evangelii in Jerusalem et mutuam cogitationem et altercationem et rerum agendarum dispositionem postremo in urbe quasi tunc primum, invicem sibi esse cognitos.*

upon a totally wrong foundation if it did not include the observance of the law; and the Galatians were on the point of falling away from the teaching of the apostle, and suffering the whole yoke of the law, circumcision and all, to be imposed on them (v. 2). So great an impression did those Judaists produce even in a church which was mainly composed of Gentile Christians, and which, the apostle declares, had received his gospel of freedom from the law with the most lively interest and the warmest expressions of affection for him personally (iv. 12, *sq.*) No other Epistle affords us so deep an insight into the grave significance of the rapidly widening struggle, and into the religious motives which operated on each side. The Judaists maintained it to be the absolute privilege of Judaism that only by the law and circumcision could any man be saved; while the apostle Paul set up the counter-proposition, that whoever was circumcised, Christ would profit him nothing (v. 2). According to the former it is in vain to be a Christian without being a Jew also. According to the latter it is in vain to be a Christian if, as a Christian, one chooses to be a Jew as well. And as it is impossible to be a Jew without accepting circumcision, and with circumcision the obligation to keep the whole law in all its particulars, it is evident at once how the man who takes this road must contradict himself, and be divided in his own mind. But the apostle is not content with exposing this contradiction to the Galatians, and showing them how unjustifiable and irrational the step was which they were about to take. He goes to the root of the matter, and attacks Judaism itself, showing that its being a religion based on law, far from giving it any distinction, reduces it to a subordinate and secondary place in the history of the religious development of mankind. Even within the sphere of Jewish religious history, the law is not the primary and original element. Above it stands the promise given to Abraham, which points forward to a time when the same faith which was counted to Abraham for righteousness will become the blessing of all nations. This promise can only be fulfilled when the law, whose

curse passes upon all who do not continue in all things that are written in the law to do them, gives way to faith. By faith, faith that is to say in him who has redeemed us from the curse of the law, we receive that which was the object of the promise made to Abraham, namely, the spirit. Thus the apostle has placed the law and the promise in such direct opposition to each other, that he is obliged to ask what the law is, what purpose it serves, when, owing to its want of power to give life, righteousness could not come by it. The answer which he gives to this question is that the law was interposed between the promise and the time when faith should come, because of transgressions, not to prevent them, but that in them sin might attain to its full manifestation and reality. This was the interval of the schoolmastership of the law, when mankind, being concluded under sin, was to be detained in ward till it had become of full age, being set free from the law to receive the sonship of God through faith in Christ.

Thus Judaism is nothing more than the religion of the law in contradistinction to Christianity, which is the religion of the spirit. Both its position in the world and its inner constitution declare that the function of Judaism is that of effecting a transition, of filling up an interval. The object it is there to serve is to exercise the stern severity of a watcher set to mark transgressions, and to keep the promise and the fulfilment apart, till the period which God has fixed for this event in the order of the world arrive (the *πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου*, Gal. iv. 4), and the promise reach its fulfilment. Nay, the apostle places Judaism even lower. Not only does it make men liable to the yoke of the law. Like Paganism, it has its religious institutions and forms of worship which are bound to particular times, to days, and months, and years. Thus it makes man dependent on the same elemental and material nature-powers, the adoration of which is characteristic of Pagan nature-religion; and on this side at least stands on no higher stage of religious development than Paganism does.¹ As surely then as

¹ The apostle's object in this passage is simply to define the position which is due to the law in the divine government of the world. Cf. the very acute and

it is a law of the divine government of the world, that there is a progress from the minority and the restriction of boyhood to the majority and the maturity of manhood, from bondage to freedom, from the flesh to the spirit, so surely does Christianity stand high above Judaism; and it can only be regarded as an irrational inversion of the relation which God has ordained, to fall back from Christianity into Judaism. So lofty is the standpoint on which the apostle here appears to us when we see him for the first time setting forth in logical order the arguments with which he resisted the claims of his Judaising opponents! Not only does he repudiate, as utterly unjustifiable, the demand which they had made with regard to circumcision, he denies that the law possessed that absolute right which the Jew ascribed to it. He places Judaism and Christianity together under the light of a great religio-historical contemplation, and of a view of the course of the world before the universal idea of which the particularism of Judaism must disappear. The demand of circumcision which was made upon the Gentile Christians amounted to a claim that, in submitting to that rite, they should acknowledge the absolute superiority which the Jewish nation as God's chosen people possessed over all the other nations of the world. This claim the apostle's wide and comprehensive view of history sufficiently disposed of. The cardinal point of his dialectical polemic, however, is to be found in the passage where he draws the conclusion from the previous discussion regarding the law and the promise, that all who are baptized into Christ enter at once, in that very act, into a new community, in which all the causes of division between man and man, which are to be found in the outward circumstances of life, are at once removed, so that there

accurate analysis of the course of the apostle's thought here, in Holsten, *op. cit.* p. 30, *sq.*, where the result is summed up as follows:—The law cannot be considered as the absolute purpose of God, but it is a relative purpose: it is taken up into his absolute purpose as a means. Thus, while it is distinguished from the promise, its unity with the promise is maintained. In God's purpose of salvation the νόμος is distinguished from the ἐπαγγελία, but in the economy of salvation they are in unity with each other. (ὁ μεσίτης οὐκ ἔστιν ἐνός—ὁ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ.)

is no difference any longer between the Jew and the Greek, between circumcision and uncircumcision, but all may regard themselves as children of Abraham. All are one in Christ, in the same faith which manifests itself by love.

The inner force of truth and the acuteness of his logical demonstrations give the apostle an unquestionable superiority over his Judaistic opponents. But what could all this avail, if the evidence of the truth of Christian teaching was to be sought for, not in the teaching itself, but in the apostolic authority of the teacher? and if, when Paul was compared with the earlier apostles, they were seen to be the immediate witnesses of the truth declared by Jesus, while his apostolic authority was founded on no external warrant or commission whatever, but simply on the assurance of his apostolic consciousness in his own mind? Accordingly, we can discern plainly enough, even in the Epistle to the Galatians, that he was well aware of the intimate and inseparable connection between these two things—the truth of his Gospel, and the assertion of his apostolic authority. He could only maintain the former by securing his position with regard to the latter: by establishing his right to the position of an apostle as against the older apostles. What then are his apostolic credentials; and if he affirmed that he alone was the true apostle of Jesus Christ, how stood the case with the older apostles who put forth the same claim for themselves? The dispute which had arisen about the necessity of circumcision and the permanent validity of the law, necessarily opened up further issues.

Whatever may have been the result of Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, and of his controversy with his opponents in the Galatian Churches, the dispute did not end there. Not long after that Epistle was written, we meet with opponents of the apostle in a different quarter of his sphere of labour, whose attacks upon him seem to be dictated by the same motives, and to be carried on in the same spirit. There can be no doubt that the Epistle to the Galatians was written in the earlier period of the apostle's residence at Ephesus, which is to be placed in the years 54-57.

The composition of our first Epistle to the *Corinthians* belongs to the latter part of his residence there. It was occasioned by news from Corinth which showed him that he had to expect a renewal of his Galatian experiences in the Corinthian Church. Judaizing teachers had made their way into this Church also, and had unsettled the faith of the apostle's converts in his Gospel. Several divisions and parties had arisen; but the main controversy about which they were ranged originated in a party which bore the name of Peter, although there can be no doubt that Peter never was at Corinth at all, and set itself in opposition to those members of the Corinthian Church who remained faithful to the principles of Pauline Christianity.¹ The party-interests which now came to operate in various ways on the Corinthian Church arose undoubtedly out of the same great controversy which forms the subject of the Epistle to the Galatians. It is very remarkable, however, that in the two Corinthian Epistles the subjects of the law and of circumcision, which formerly occupied the forefront of the battle, have completely disappeared. A very personal question has now come to the front, a question which could not fail to be raised sooner or later, namely, the apostolic authority of Paul. What authority could he claim? in whatever way he had come to his present position, it certainly could not be said of him that he had become an apostle in the same way as the older apostles; was it not doubtful whether he could be regarded as a true and genuine apostle at all? The apostle does not address himself directly to this most important question till the end of the second Epistle; but it can easily be perceived that, throughout the whole course of the two Epistles, he never loses sight of it, and that he takes advantage of every opportunity to clear the ground, and give all the explanations necessary for the proper understanding of what he had to say for his own personal interest; so that when he takes up the personal

¹ I am still of opinion that the only view of the Corinthian parties which will explain Paul's Epistles and the nature of the parties at Corinth generally, is that the party of Cephas and the so-called party of Christ were essentially one and the same. See Paul: vol. i. 257, *sqq.*

• question he can meet his adversaries with all the force of a direct and outspoken denial of their charges. He asserts in the most emphatic way that he is an apostle as well as any other, and not a whit behind the so-great apostles whose authority was held up against him. Of the outward advantages of Jewish race he will only speak in irony, though in these also he can measure himself with them;¹ but the arguments on which he rests his case are very real and substantial ones. They are the actual results to which he can point, in the ever-widening sphere in which he had preached his Gospel, then all those painful experiences, in which he had approved himself as a servant of Christ, and finally, the visions and revelations of the Lord, of which he could boast. The apostle could not leave this last point unnoticed, when once the question of his apostolic calling had been so pointedly raised. He might appeal with the greatest justice to the success of his missionary activity;² that was a thing which could not be denied; yet it was evident that no one could be an apostle of Christ who had not been called to that office by Christ himself. In the first Epistle he had insisted emphatically on the fact that, as he was an apostle, he had also seen the Lord (ix. 1). The visions and revelations of the Lord, of which he speaks at the close of the second Epistle, are intended in like manner as a proof of his apostolic calling. They are to him what the direct call addressed to the older apostles by Jesus himself during his life on earth is to them. To the apostle himself this was the most direct and most convincing proof of his apostolic calling. But, on the other hand, he could have brought forward no evidence more subjective or with less force for others. He spoke of ecstasies, of things that he had seen in his own spirit, facts of his consciousness which could not possess the same objective reality for any one else as they had for him who was the immediate subject of them. And

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 5, 21, 22.

² Cf. especially such passages as 1 Cor. ix. 1, *sq.*; xv. 10; 2 Cor. ii. 14, *sq.*; iii. 2, *sq.*; x. 13, *sq.*; xi. 23. In the same way in the Epistle to the Galatians he cites it as a proof of the actual reality of his apostolic calling, that *ὁ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρος εἰς ἀποστολὴν περιτομῆς, ἐνέργησε καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη.*

we cannot wonder that opponents who could never bring themselves to grant the truth of the apostle's doctrine, should also have refused to grant the premisses on which it was based. It was at this point that they chiefly directed their attacks: and here the apostle could not but feel the poison of their darts, as he could not conceal from himself that on this side his attitude towards his opponents was somewhat peculiar. The excitement and irritation which he betrays when writing against them on this subject is to be interpreted as arising mainly out of his uneasiness in having to do a thing which was impossible, namely, to prove as an objective matter of fact a thing which was purely subjective in its nature. This impossibility confronted him most painfully just at the point where his dearest personal interests were involved.

When we look at the matter from this point of view, the case of the apostle's opponents appears in a very different light from that in which it has generally been regarded. They have generally been judged entirely by the very unfavourable description which the apostle gives of them. Now it may well have been that human passion and party spirit did contribute an element of baseness and selfishness to the opposition they carried on against the apostle; but why should we judge that all the wrong was on their side in opposing the claim which Paul put forward, when we remember that he not only claimed to be an apostle himself, but in carrying out his argument to its logical issue, placed his own apostolic authority above that of all the older apostles together? If he appealed to the inner certainty which he possessed regarding his vocation by Christ, and to his apostolic consciousness, they, on the other hand, stood on the historical ground of their actual connection with Christ. Thus principle stood opposed to principle; and only the future development of Christianity could decide which of the two principles would acquire the predominance over the other. In the meantime, the attacks made upon the person of the apostle, and on his apostolic authority, form a new and a noteworthy epoch in the controversy in which Judaism and Paulinism had now come to be engaged. The deep earnestness which

the apostle throws into his contendings with these opponents is enough to show the importance they had in his eyes. We should have a very mistaken notion of them did we hold their movement to have been a mere isolated phenomenon, the undirected and arbitrary action of certain individuals who were stirred up by merely fortuitous and personal motives to create disturbance and throw obstacles in the apostle's way in his own sphere of labour. Everything combines to show that they had a great party behind them, and knew themselves to have a right to appear as the agents and emissaries of that party. Not only was the name of the apostle Peter the standard under which their efforts were carried on,—a name which showed what spirit they were of, and made their cause appear to be the common cause of all Jewish Christians. We learn from the apostle himself (2 Cor. iii. 1) that they had brought letters of recommendation with them, which left no doubt as to the party they belonged to. From whom could such letters of recommendation proceed but from men who had such a position in the mother Church, that they could count on their authority being recognised in foreign Churches too? These letters prove to us how party spirit was growing, how the two parties were being ranged in a position of antagonism to each other, how efforts were being made by each party to counteract the other locally. They also represent to us, in a new and striking way, the radical difference between the two principles which are here contending with each other. They exhibited to the Corinthians the contrast between the two conflicting principles of authority. The authority of the one party having been outwardly communicated, was capable of being delegated by such credentials. Against this outward authority the apostle had nothing to affirm when it came to the point but his own independent self-consciousness. This is his position in the passage where he speaks of these letters of commendation of his opponents (2 Cor. iii. 1-18).

In dealing with his opponents at Corinth, he takes up, as he did in the Epistle to the Galatians, the standpoint of the higher religio-historical contemplation. Judaism and Christianity are

related to each other as the old and the new *διαθήκη*; the old one is antiquated and extinct, but the new one is bright and luminous. In this distinction between the two dispensations, and in the spirit as the principle of the Christian consciousness, is to be found the justification of his apostolic authority. The character of Judaism is that of a religion of concealment and restraint, the religious consciousness which belongs to it is narrow and finite, but Christianity is the opposite of this; in it the religious consciousness has opened up to perfect clearness and self-certainty, and does not need to rely on any material aids. And this is the principle of his apostolic authority too. With those who refuse to recognise him as an apostle he can use no other argument than that their religious consciousness is imperfect, that they are at a standpoint at which the veil, the symbol of Mosaism, still lies upon their Jewish consciousness, and does not allow them to perceive the fact that the end of the old religion is now come. The principle of Paulinism could not be expressed more simply and accurately than is done by the apostle in this same passage, when he sums up his argument against the old covenant and those who had gained the Christian consciousness, and yet remained standing under it, in the words (2 Cor. iii. 17): The Lord is the spirit: and the spirit is liberty. That is to say, the principle and essence of Paulinism is the emancipation of the consciousness from every authority that is external or exercised through human means, the removal of all confining barriers, the elevation of the spirit to a standpoint where everything lies revealed and open in luminous clearness to its eye, the independence and immediateness of the self-consciousness.

Thus the apostle meets the opponents of his doctrine and of his apostolic authority by demonstrating the imperfection, the narrowness, the finiteness of the religion of the Law. But to get rid altogether of that particularism which was so closely interwoven with Judaism, that national pride which led the Jew to think that because he was a Jew he was better and more highly privileged than all other men, it was necessary to attack it more directly, to lay

the axe more sharply to its root. This could not be done without a profounder and more searching appeal to the moral consciousness than could be made by a discussion which after all belonged to the sphere of abstract and theoretical contemplation. It is in the Epistle to the Romans that we see the apostle proceed to this, the third and most important stage of the long and hard struggle which his principle had to support as it forced its way through all the forms of opposition it encountered. Regarded from this point of view, the Epistle to the Romans appears in the light not merely of a compendium of Pauline dogmatics, but as a historical source of the first importance.¹

What was it that led the apostle to write to the Roman Church, and to address that Church in such an epistle as this? As a rule he wrote only to Churches which he himself had founded. The Roman Church was not one of his, but neither is it known that any of the other apostles was directly concerned in its foundation. What naturally suggests itself as the probable account of its formation is, that it grew up of itself in consequence of the frequent intercourse which the Jews in Rome, long before this a numerous body, maintained with Judea and Jerusalem.² It was not even a Gentile-Christian Church, it was at least mainly composed of Jewish Christians, and its prevailing character was Jewish Christian. It has indeed been generally supposed that the Christians at Rome to whom the apostle wrote must have been Gentile Christians; but when we look at the whole tendency of the Epistle, at the aim to which it is directed, and at the nature of the greater part of its contents, it should be impossible any longer to question, that the apostle is dealing mainly with Jewish Chris-

¹ Cf. my essay on the object and the line of thought of the Epistle to the Romans, in the *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1857, p. 60, *sq.*, 184, *sq.* See also Paul, etc., i. 308, *sqq.*

² A clear proof of the impulse which was inherent in Christianity to communicate and propagate itself. With regard to the spread of Christianity locally, we should not ascribe too much to the personal exertions of the apostles. There seem to have been a great number of Christian Churches at a very early date in countries which there is no evidence that any of the apostles ever visited.

tians. This very fact must have been the immediate occasion of the Epistle to the Romans: the apostle addressed himself to them because they were Jewish Christians, and because he saw in them the Church which both in virtue of its position in the metropolis, and from the number and influence of its members, stood at the head of all the Churches out of Palestine, and might be taken as representative of all the Jewish Christians who lived among the Gentile races. And another circumstance which may have helped to fix the apostle's attention on this Church for some time back, and even made him wish to visit it, as he says i. 13, was the unembarrassed position which he occupied towards it. He had not come into any such personal conflict with opponents in it as in the controversies he had waged in the Galatian and Corinthian Churches. The discussions in his earlier Epistles had been disturbed by a great deal of personal matter, which added nothing to the argument, but, on the contrary, introduced irritation. But in writing to the Roman Church he could take up the same questions again, and deal with them calmly and with an objectivity which had not been possible before. He could place the great argument in new points of view, so as to add immeasurably to the profoundness, and suggestiveness, and thoroughness of the discussion, and bespeak for it a much more favourable judgment on the part of those whom he was seeking to convince. Even at the cardinal points of his argument we find him expressing himself in a much milder, more conciliatory, more sympathetic tone than had hitherto been the case. This, certainly, is only one side; the other side, apparently very different and yet intimately connected with the first, in the thought on which the whole is based, is a keenness of dialectical polemics which presses deeper than in any of the previous Epistles, and seems bent on severing once for all the very roots from which Jewish particularism derived its justification. These two features, the kind spirit with which he comes to meet his opponent, and seeks to place himself at his point of view, and not to judge him too severely, and the keenness with which he confutes him, are what give the Epistle to the Romans its

peculiar interest. Hence moreover it comes, that this Epistle contains the deepest and most comprehensive argument for Pauline universalism as against Jewish particularism. For this, and nothing else, is the true theme of the Epistle.

There might be many who no longer clung with the old tenacity to the privilege which attached to the circumcision of the Jews as against the uncircumcision of the Gentiles, who could no longer conceal from themselves the insufficiency of the law for salvation, who were not offended at the admission of the Gentiles to the Messianic blessings, and who could even dismiss from their minds the scruples and objections with which the apostolic calling and authority of the apostle had formerly been regarded. But even for them there was still a point which could not but give rise to some uneasiness. What a disproportion was arising, since the conversion of the Gentiles had come to be on such a scale and went on with still increasing strides, between the heathen and the Jewish world! How was it to be explained that though the Jewish people was the ancient and chosen people of God and the object of God's promises, yet a great part of that people had no part in the salvation which had appeared in Christ, and the Gentiles were pressing in to occupy the place which God's own people had left empty? This question sums up the claim to which Jewish particularism still clung, and which it imagined to be indefeasible. It was not a question of material rights so much as a question of faith, and the apostle would have been stifling his own feelings of patriotism in an unnatural way, had not this question moved him to the very depths of his heart. The question appeared to him to be so important that he made the attempt not merely to remove the hindrance which it presented to the frank reception of the universalism of Christianity, but also to come to an understanding on the subject with his fellow-countrymen. He goes into the question with the deepest interest in the salvation of his own people, but the deeper he goes into it the more does he become aware that what he is dealing with is simply another form of that old claim of a national privilege which is the general assump-

tion of Jewish particularism. Is it really the case, he asks, when the question is considered from the moral-religious point of view, that the Jew as such is better and entitled to higher privileges than other men? Or do not all the advantages he has had over others in the history of his nation rather increase his responsibility before God? This is the point from which the apostle sets out in his Epistle; at the forefront of his argument he places as his guiding thought the contrast between the righteousness of God and the unrighteousness of men, which appears on the very surface of history as a notorious fact among Jews and Gentiles alike. In this respect, Jews and Gentiles are on the same level. If what makes the immoral actions of the Gentiles inexcusable and worthy of punishment is, that they did those actions against their own better knowledge and conscience (i. 19, *sq.*), the same is true in the case of the Jews. If there be any difference, it must arise out of the different degree of light men have when they do what they ought not to do; but this difference does not turn out to the advantage of the Jews. The Gentiles are not without a law; they have the law of their conscience; and if the Jew has the advantage of another law in addition to this, all the distinctions of which he boasts in reliance upon it only tell against himself. He is not better than the Gentiles are: he is only so much the worse, so much the more worthy of punishment, in proportion as his knowledge places him above them, and as he knows clearly and perfectly out of his law what he ought to do, while all the time he does the contrary. Since then the true moral worth of man consists in his doing that which he feels that he ought to do, this one consideration makes an end of the distinction between Jew and Gentile. Uncircumcision is as circumcision, and circumcision as uncircumcision. The important matter is not what the Jew is outwardly, but what he is inwardly in his heart before God (ii. 25-29). Should the Jew still seek to have some advantage over the Gentile, he must be referred to the Scripture, which itself attests that Jews and Gentiles are under sin; and what the Scripture or the law says, it says to them that are under the law. All the passages of Scripture which speak

of the depravity of men are applicable to the Jews first of all, and all combine to prove that no one can be justified before God by the deeds of the law. What comes by the law is only the knowledge of sin. If then there be a righteousness, it is only the righteousness of God by faith in Jesus Christ, by which all boasting is excluded. Faith alone corresponds to the universal idea of God. If it were possible to be justified and saved by the deeds of the law, as the Jews suppose, then none but the Jews would have this righteousness, and God would be the God of the Jews only. But he is the God not of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also (iii. 21-31). In faith then, the distinction between circumcision and uncircumcision disappears, and as certainly as the universal sinfulness of mankind makes it impossible that there can be any other way of salvation than the righteousness of God by faith, so certainly is the universalism of Christianity established in its full significance, as the apostle expresses it in the words, that God is not the God of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also. This universalism is founded deep in the fact of the moral consciousness which will not be gainsaid, that Jew as well as Gentile knows himself to be a sinner, and under the judgment of God.

Now the whole force of the apostle's argument depends on the assumption of the objective truth of that new way of salvation which he announces. His Epistle has therefore to address itself to the further task of adjusting this way of salvation to the religious consciousness of Jews and Jewish Christians, and removing the scruples and objections which still stood in the way of its reception in their minds (iv. 1—viii. 39). There are three steps in this argument: 1. The Jewish religious view of the world contains in itself all the positions on which the apostle's doctrine is based. The history of mankind from Adam to Christ divides itself into two great periods. These periods form a contrast with each other: each has its own peculiar principle, by which every separate part of it is determined. It thus appears as an absolute postulate of the history of the world and of revelation, that there is not only a condemnation to death, but also a justification to life (iv. 1—v. 21).

2. It is not the case, as the opponents of the doctrine of faith assert (cf. iii. 8), that it takes away the force of the moral requirement of the law. The believing Christian and sin have nothing whatever to do with each other: the death of Christ has severed absolutely the bond which connected man and sin, and as absolutely is man dis severed from the law through which sin comes to life (vi. 1—vii. 6). 3. At the same time sin and law are not identical. The law is in itself good and holy, in its inmost essence it is spiritual, and only in its relation to nature and to the human consciousness does it give rise to a conflict between flesh and spirit. In this conflict the religious ego of Judaism remains in the condition of an unhappy consciousness, and cannot break through the barrier which separates Judaism from Christianity. Only in Christianity is the flesh encountered by the spirit, the principle which has power to overcome the flesh. Thus only when he receives the spirit is man placed in the relation of sonship to God; and here, in his unity with Christ, there is an end of all that holds man apart from God, so that nothing can separate him from the love of God in Christ. Delivered from the dominion of the powers which ruled in the pre-Christian world, the flesh, sin, and the law, and set free to live the life of the spirit, man can now, by reason of the spirit which dwells in him, know himself as spiritually one with God (vii. 7—viii. 39).

It is at this point (ix. 1, *sqq.*) that the apostle, looking back on all the blessed and saving effects of faith which he has been describing, turns to consider the case of his own fellow-countrymen. On the one hand, he uses the tenderest expressions of sympathy towards them, and labours with all his heart to show them that the participation of the heathen in the kingdom of God does not take place at the expense of Israel. But on the other hand, he cannot do this without denying out and out that primacy of the Jews over the Gentiles with which he has all along had to contend. He meets it at every point on which it relies, and disallows it even in its mildest aspect, in that purely theocratic form where it appeals simply to the faithfulness and truthfulness of God.

For what advantage has the Jew over the Gentile, if there is no such thing as righteousness by the deeds of the law? It is true that the promises of God cannot remain unfulfilled; yet they are fulfilled without any human co-operation. What claim can man assert against God, if God can do what he will according to his pleasure, and can make of man either a vessel of mercy, or a vessel of wrath! Apart from faith, man can only be reminded of his absolute dependence on God, and if faith be taken into account, it is faith that is the stone of stumbling for Israel. All guilt consists simply in unbelief; and though the apostle expresses a hope that finally, after the fulness of the Gentiles has been gathered in, the promises will be fulfilled by the conversion of Israel, yet he grounds this hope, with which, as a born Israelite, as a descendant of Abraham and of the tribe of Benjamin (xi. 1), he finds it hard to part, not upon Jewish nationality and what is connected with it, but on the general truth that sooner or later all things must return to that God from whom and through whom all things are, and in whom all things have the final purpose of their being and subsistence (chap. ix.-xi.).¹

So utterly is Jewish particularism devoid of every justification, outward or inward. The absolute nullity of all its claims is the great idea which pervades the whole discussion, and which forms the connection between the two great sections of the Epistle (i.-viii. and ix.-xi.): a connection which is not merely external, but internal. From the analysis of its contents which we have undertaken it at once appears, that its great significance lies not so much in its doctrinal discussions about sin and grace, as in its practical bearing on the most important controversy of these times, the relation between Jews and Gentiles. How could the two elements ever have been combined in the unity of one Christian Church,

¹ This is a part of the universalism through which the apostle looks upon the world. The *ἡττημα* of the Jews and the *πλήρωμα* of the Gentiles arrive at the same end, because each has its own period, and as God has concluded all in unbelief, so he will have mercy upon all (xi. 32). The apostle can imagine no consummation but the salvation of all. The doctrine of eternal punishment belongs only to Judaism.

had not the work been done which this Epistle was designed to do? It was necessary that the particularism of Judaism which opposed to the heathen world so repellent a demeanour and such offensive claims, should be uprooted, and that the baselessness of its prejudices and pretensions, of the privilege and the superiority it asserted, fully exposed to the world's eye. This was the service which the apostle did to mankind by his magnificent dialectic.

We do not know what impression this Epistle produced upon the Roman Church, nor whether any practical result was at once attained. But we can scarcely be wrong in assuming that, in a Church in which, as we may infer from the Epistle itself, the antagonism between the two parties had already been in some degree softened down, an Epistle of so weighty and comprehensive a character did not fail to produce the fruit which the apostle desired to see.¹ It must also have helped to impress upon the Roman Church that freer, more conciliatory, and mediating tendency in consequence of which it afterwards attained so commanding a position. In spite of its controversial keenness the Epistle has unmistakably a conciliatory character: it bears upon its face not only the deep interest the apostle felt in the salvation of his fellow-countrymen, but also the profound desire which constrained him to try to approach them in every possible way, both of the reason and the affections, and to clear away completely, if it might be, everything that continued to estrange them from him. It is as if the apostle had turned to the Roman Church in the conviction that it was peculiarly fitted to undertake the part of a mediator, as it were, in the great question of his apostolic calling, in which he was still confronted by so many bitter opponents and persecutors. It appears the more likely that the apostle was occupied with thoughts like these, and was seeking to do everything that lay in his power, to get the cause for which he was

¹ The two last chapters of the Epistle are not genuine, but an addition by a later hand. Thus the long list of persons to whom questions are addressed in the last chapter affords evidence that the Epistle of the apostle did not fail to attain its end.

working looked at in a conciliatory and loving spirit, and so brought nearer to a final decision, when we consider the circumstances in which the Epistle was written. It was during his last residence at Corinth that he wrote it. He was on the point of setting off for Jerusalem once more—a journey which was undertaken in connection with a piece of business in which he had for some time taken a deep interest, as he saw in it a means fitted to draw the Gentile and Jewish Christians closer to each other, and to make his peace with the Church at Jerusalem. In the Epistle to the Galatians he states (ii. 10), that ever since the assembly at Jerusalem he had never lost sight of a work by which the Churches now divided might be reunited, namely, the support of the poor in Jerusalem. In the period during which the two Epistles to the Corinthians were written, he had given special attention to this undertaking (1 Cor. xvi. 1, *sqq.*, and 2 Cor. chap. viii. and ix.). As the subsidy was important for the object of his journey, he naturally desired that it should be as large as possible. It must have been his uncertainty on this point that made him think at first of sending the contributions by delegates to be chosen by the Corinthians, who should carry an Epistle from him to the Christians at Jerusalem. He adds, however (1 Cor. xvi. 4), that if the affair be worth while, that is, if the contributions prove to be so considerable as to be likely to help him with the end he had in view, he would go with them himself. That the object he thought of was not merely the material sustenance of the poor, that he had another aim much more closely connected with his own apostolic calling, he himself states very distinctly in the Second Epistle, ix. 12, *sq.*, where he says that the undertaking of this service is not only one that supplies a want, there is also a surplus in it by reason of the many thanksgivings which are offered to God for it. The Christians of Jerusalem praise God that the confession of the Gentile Christians is so entirely subject to the Gospel of Christ, that they seek to be nothing but the confessors of the Gospel of Christ: And as they recognise in this gift the heartiness of the fellowship which the Gentile Christians bear to them, their heart

turns to them, their prayers for them express the yearning that they feel towards them, because the grace of God has been manifested in them in so superlative a way. An attempt was to be made, then, to remove the wall of partition which still subsisted between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians, and to win for Pauline Christianity that recognition which was still denied to it. The apostle believed that the mistrust and prejudice which the Jewish Christians still felt were due entirely to the old relations, which had now passed away, and that the love-offering which the Gentile Christian Churches were now to send to the Church of Jerusalem in token of brotherly unity, would produce such an impression as to remove these feelings altogether. It was no doubt in furtherance of this design, and with the contribution which had been collected, that he soon afterwards set out on his journey to Jerusalem. But how painfully was he disappointed in these hopes!

It is not necessary to enter in detail into the circumstances under which the apostle met his well-known fate at Jerusalem. There is one question, however, which possesses special interest, namely, who were the authors of those tumults in which the Roman military authorities had to interfere in order to rescue the apostle from the rage of his opponents? Were these tumults caused by Jews, or by Jewish Christians? They were zealots for the law, men who saw in the apostle a transgressor of the law, an apostate, a declared enemy of the national religion. But not only the Jews were zealots of this description, the Jewish Christians also shared this spirit, and carried it even further than the Jews. In their case the mission to the Gentiles had raised the question of the law into a matter of the keenest party interest. And accordingly we can discern, even in the narrative of the Acts, in which the true state of the case is as far as possible concealed, that the Jewish Christians were by no means so unconcerned in the outbreaks of hatred to which the apostle fell a victim, as is generally supposed. Protected by his Roman citizenship the apostle was removed to Rome, after two years' imprisonment at Caesarea. According to the Acts his imprisonment at Rome lasted for a

further period of two years : but we are not told when or how it terminated. Even assuming the genuineness of the Epistles which profess to have been written by the apostle during his captivity at Rome, we have no certain or noteworthy information about this period. The most remarkable fact is that the termination of these two years coincides with the date of the great Neronian conflagration, and the persecution of the Christians to which it led. Nothing can be more probable, than that the apostle did not survive this fatal period.

Up to the time when the apostle disappears from the scene of the history, we have before us nothing but differences and oppositions, between which no certain way of compromise or reconciliation yet appears. It was upon that side, from which the great division had proceeded, which broke in upon the common religious consciousness, which Jews and Jewish Christians had hitherto enjoyed together, that a certain need was first felt for approximation and reconciliation between the two parties. But the advance did not meet with such a response as might have been expected from the other party. There were as yet only Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians, with divergent tendencies and interests. There was no ecclesiastical association to combine the two. Nor has history been able as yet to point to any considerable cause which can be said to have effected the filling up of the great gulf which since the events at Antioch had continued to exist between Peter and Paul, the heads of the two parties. All we can say is, that there must have been reconciling elements in the Church of Rome. This was the case before, and the influence which Paul had over this Church, both by his Epistle and by his personal residence there afterwards, must have strengthened this tendency. And how could the martyrdom with which the great apostle of the Gentiles certainly in one way or another finished his work in that city, fail to leave behind it a healing influence for the future of the Church ? A legend of much significance, which however arose at a much later time, connects the brotherly unity of the two apostles with this death. This is accordingly a fixed point in the history of the further

development of these relations. But the interval which elapsed between the death of the apostle Paul and that point contains many movements in many different directions, and the development of the history will conduct us to that goal by a longer road than might have been supposed.

The main tendency of the period must have been, as we may infer from the result which we have mentioned, to bring the two opposing parties nearer to each other, by a process of smoothing down their differences, and finding the mean between their opposing principles. This tendency must, from the very nature of the case, have become more and more general and predominant. But if we are to follow it in its whole range, we must first of all obtain a clear view of those points where the existing antagonism is most extreme. This is of course the case, where the antagonism is conscious and designed: there it is most bitter: each of the two parties makes it its chief end to assert that in which it differs from the other. The antithesis is wilful and resolute, and the goal of a possible union is removed to a distant future. Are there then, we have to ask, phenomena of such a kind after the death of the apostle Paul? Do we find instances in which Paulinism takes the offensive against Jewish Christianity? do we find instances in which Jewish Christianity keeps up the same keen opposition against Paulinism with which the Jewish Christians had originally set themselves against the apostle Paul?

Next to the Epistles of Paul, the Gospel of Luke¹ is the purest and most important source we possess for the knowledge of Paulinism. It contains special reference to the destruction of Jeru-

¹ Cf. my *Krit. Untersuchungen über die kanon. Evangelien*, p. 427, and my work on the Gospel of Mark, p. 191, *sq.* Küstlin, *Ursprung und Composition der synopt. Evang.*, p. 132, *sq.* Hilgenfeld: *die Evangelien*, p. 220, *sq.* Küstlin does not see in this Gospel the sharp and outspoken opposition to the Judaism of the Gospel of Matthew that I do. I consider this to be a defect in his view of that work. On the other hand, the unknown author of the work: *Die Evangelien, ihre Verfasser und ihre Verhältniss zu einander*, Leipzig, 1845, appears to me to have stated this antithesis too broadly. But the merit belongs to him of having been the first to put the question clearly and in the full light of the issues it involves.

saalem, so that its composition must at any rate be later than the year 70. From the earliest times it has been held to be a Pauline Gospel, but it is only very recently that the Pauline character which distinguishes it from the other two synoptic Gospels has been clearly and accurately recognised. This point is so closely connected with the question as to the composition of the Gospel that we can only touch on its more general aspects; yet, even here, we shall find unmistakable evidence of its Pauline tendency. The spirit and tendency of the Gospel of Luke can only be understood by the light of its relation to the Gospel of Matthew; and so the Judaism of the latter supplies a good standard for judging of the Paulinism of the former. Here Jesus is not merely the Jewish Messiah of the Gospel of Matthew: he is the Redeemer of mankind in general, and, in this sense, the Son of God. In accordance with this his universal mission, the whole representation of his personality which this Gospel gives us is a higher and more comprehensive one than that of Matthew. In all his works, in his teaching, in his miracles, especially in the power he exercises over demons, and in the whole of his revelation of himself, his personality appears to be superhuman. And herein lies the reason of the well-marked advance which this Gospel has made in the view which is taken of the Gospel history, and in the execution of its plan. The conception of the Gospel history which we find here is a long way beyond the views on which the Gospel of Matthew is based, and a long way towards the views of the Gospel of John. The Galilean ministry is very much shortened, while that in Judea and Jerusalem is proportionately extended: the announcement of the death and resurrection of Jesus as the final issue and consummation of his whole earthly activity, appears much earlier in the narrative (ix. 22, 51). In his struggle with his adversaries he takes the offensive, and the struggle is more pronounced and uncompromising. The demonic power whose instruments these adversaries are, interposes at definite crises in the course of the history (iv. 13, x. 18, xxii. 3, 53). By this means, and by repeated declarations, the great truth is clearly set forth, that Judaism is

not the true or appropriate field for the accomplishment of the work of Jesus.

But to restrict ourselves here to the main point we have to do with: the features of the Gospel, from which we see that Pauline universalism is the theory which underlies it, are the following. Not only do we not find those utterances of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew which savour of particularism,¹ but there are several stories and parables which are expressly meant to set forth the universalism of Christianity. The Jews reject the Gospel; it is the Gentiles who frankly and willingly receive it. Though Jesus himself does not proclaim the Gospel in heathen lands, yet he virtually inaugurates the mission to the Gentiles by his travels in Samaria, which, according to Luke's Gospel, he twice entered from Galilee (ix. 52, xvii. 11). The choice of the seventy, moreover, showed that the Gospel was intended not merely for the twelve tribes of Israel, but for the whole of the Gentile races. It is equally indicative of the Pauline character of the Gospel that it knows nothing of the identity which is asserted in the Gospel of Matthew between the teaching of Jesus and the law and the Old Testament. The Gospel of Luke does not contain the utterance, which is so characteristic of the Gospel of Matthew, about the fulfilment of the law and its permanent validity. What the Gospel of Matthew says of the law, that not one tittle of it shall fail, the Gospel of Luke, according to the original reading, applies to the words of Jesus himself (xvi. 17).² It even makes Jesus declare that, with

¹ Cf. Köstlin, *op. cit.*, p. 178, *sq.*

² The investigations as to the Marcionite Gospel have been taken up again by Schweigler, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1843, p. 575, *sq.*; Nachaport. *Zeit.*, 1846, i. p. 260, *sq.*, and by Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions und das Kanonische Evangelium des Lukas*, Tüb. 1846. Thorough discussions of the question have also been contributed by Volkmar in the *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, p. 110, *sq.*; and in the work, *Das Evangelium Marcions*, Leipzig, 1852; and by Hilgenfeld in the *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1853, p. 194, *sq.* The result to which all this has led is, that the Marcionite Gospel contained not only alterations which Marcion introduced designedly, but also, and certainly, readings which there is every reason to think more original than those of our canonical text. I think there is good reason for adding to these passages that which I have mentioned in the text, xvi. 17, and accordingly read with Hilgenfeld, p. 231, *sq.*, *Die Evangelien*, p. 201, τῶν λόγων μου. On the Gospel of Marcion see *Das Markus-evangelium*, p. 191, *sq.*

the appearance of John the Baptist, the Mosaic law has come to an end, and that, since that time, the law has been superseded by the preaching of the kingdom of God (xvi. 16). Again, this Gospel speaks of the older apostles in a way which can only be explained by supposing that it was desired to place them in an unfavourable light so as to exalt, at their expense, the authority and the apostolic qualifications of the apostle Paul. A very significant instance of this is, that the Gospel of Luke entirely ignores the declaration of Jesus, given in the Gospel of Matthew, which was the principal evidence for the claims of Peter. Here Peter is called blessed on account of the confession he had made; he is declared to be the rock on which the Church of Jesus is to be built, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and the keys of heaven are given to him, with power to bind and loose. The Gospel of Luke, of course, could not for a moment admit such a primacy of Peter. In the same way Luke omits the power given to the twelve (Matt. xviii. 18) to forgive and retain sins, with the context in which it occurs. And besides this, in many passages it presents the older apostles in a very unfavourable light, so as almost to suggest to the reader, that if Jesus had no more capable disciples than these, the true and proper disciples were still wanting, such an apostle, *i.e.* as Paul.¹ We cannot suppose that the Gospel of

¹ Cf. my *Kritische Untersuchungen*, p. 435, *sq.* According to Köstlin, the author of the Gospel of Luke had no intention to lower the authority of the twelve; he only wished to bring out as strongly as possible the exalted nature of the Christian revelation, and for this purpose he dwelt so frequently upon their incapacity to understand Jesus. The claim which he opposes is the claim put forward by the twelve of being the only persons commissioned to preach Jesus. But what purpose do the new set of preachers of the Gospel serve, if those who were there before were quite fit for the office, and the new ones were merely so many more of the same kind? Köstlin even thinks (p. 267) that the introduction of the seventy points to a Gospel of Peter as the source of our Gospel of Luke. The writing in which the seventy originally appeared, he is of opinion, must have been one which sought to assign the Jewish and the non-Jewish mission to different disciples, in order to secure the whole services of the twelve for the people of Israel, and at the same time to show that care had been taken for the instruction of the Gentile world. But when we consider that, after the idea of the mission to the Gentiles had entered the minds of the Jewish Christians (even Peter had not entertained the idea at first, Gal. ii. 7), they set to work to make Peter an

Luke rests on a purer historical tradition than that of Matthew, or that, where such considerable differences occur between it and the other two Gospels, it gives the more true and faithful presentation of the Gospel history. When, therefore, we find that history treated from this peculiar point of view even in its reports of the words and acts of Jesus, we must conclude that this was done in order to provide a historical justification for Pauline universalism. The Gospel of Luke thus testifies to the vigorous self-consciousness with which the Pauline spirit lived on in his faithful adherents after the death of the apostle himself. It makes no secret of that which so much care was afterwards taken to conceal, of the personal relation to the older apostles which was implied in Paulinism, of which it was a necessary assumption that, as Paulinism was higher than Judaism, so the older apostles stood at a lower stage than Paul. The markedly Paulinising tendency of this Gospel has

apostle of the Gentiles, we cannot consider it likely that it was a Petrine Gospel in which the seventy were first introduced into the evangelical tradition. But from whatever source the Gospel of Luke derived its seventy disciples, the antithesis to the twelve which the 10th chapter presents is perfectly clear, and it is impossible to ignore the Pauline interest on which it is based. This conclusion is not weakened by what is pointed out by Küstlin, that the evident distinction here paid to the seventy makes it the more striking that so very little is related about them, and that when they came back, x. 20, they receive from Jesus a somewhat severe exhortation to humility. Notwithstanding this admonition, how could they be exalted more highly than when they are told that their names are written in heaven (comp. Rev. xxi. 12)? The very fact that nothing more is said about them, when we regard it in the light of what is the only possible meaning of the words of Jesus, x. 20, viz., that the important point concerning them is not the result of their activity which is open to the eye here, but what Heaven sees to be connected with their names, clearly shows them to be the representatives of an idea which has still to be brought to light in them, which, accordingly, was to be realised in Paulinism as opposed to Judaism. In dealing with passages like this, where the antitheses are pointedly expressed, it is by no means in the interests of the criticism of the Gospels to labour to remove the antitheses, and show them to be softer than they are, especially if this be done with a view to getting a show of support for a new hypothesis about the possible sources of a Gospel. On the contrary, these are the passages, in the light of which the passages where the tendency is less evident are to be explained. With regard to Luke viii. 54, I cannot but think it an arbitrary proceeding to except the apostles from the *παύρες* whom Jesus orders to leave the room. Who is left to be the *παύρες*, if, as we are told in ver. 51, there was no one there but the three apostles and the parents of the damsel? Küstlin, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

given it great importance, for whenever the Pauline spirit manifested itself afterwards with special power, it turned to this Gospel to find there its own purest expression. So much had it the reputation of being the Gospel of the apostle Paul, that Church fathers like Eusebius (iii. 4) thought that when Paul spoke in his Epistles of his Gospel, as at 2 Tim. ii. 7, he must be referring to the Gospel of Luke.

No one placed it higher than *Marcion* did. In the early history of Paulinism he is, next to the author of the Gospel of Luke, the most characteristic representative and champion of the pure Pauline principle.¹ Marcion is by no means a mutilator and falsifier of the Gospel of Luke in the sense in which the Fathers so regarded him. In many passages there can be no doubt that his text is the genuine and original one. Even in cases where he has undeniably permitted himself to abbreviate or to change in the interests of his Paulinism and of his Gnostic system, it is a mistaken judgment which is generally passed on his procedure. He must be judged according to the analogy of the relations in which the authors of our canonical Gospels stand to one another. Each successive evangelist takes the body of the Gospel history, which he supposes to be a thing continuing in the Church unchanged, puts it under a new point of view, and clothes it in a new form of representation. Still there can be no question that the negative, antithetical, critical tendency of Marcion's Gospel bears witness to a distinct and vigorous Paulinism. His aim was to excise from the Gospel, as far as possible, everything that bore the stamp of Judaism, and to exhibit the whole breadth of the contrast between the Gospel and

¹ This is not to be understood in the sense which Ritschl, *Entstehung*, etc., 2d ed., 311, imputes to me, as if Paulinism had developed into Marcionitism, and the pure root-principle of Paul had been preserved in this heresy. This is clear, and Ritschl might have spared himself the further remark, that Monotheism and the recognition of the unity of the Old and New Testaments, which is connected with the idea of the promise, are such inseparable elements of the purely Pauline view as to make Marcion's agreement with Paul, even though intended by him, more superficial and apparent than real. It is notorious that Marcion was not only a Paulinist, but a Gnostic, but this does not hinder his antinomism from being genuinely Pauline, and he is entitled to a place in the history of Paulinism.

the law and the Old Testament. The work which accompanied his Gospel under the title "Antithesis" had a similar object, which indeed is plainly indicated in its name. It consisted of a juxtaposition of sentences of the Old Testament and sentences of the Gospel of Luke, in such a way as to place at once before the reader's eye the contrast between the law and the Gospel, and was intended as an introduction to his Gospel, to indicate the point of view from which the latter should be read.¹ It was not without good reason that he placed the Epistle to the Galatians first in his collection of the Pauline Epistles, not from chronological reasons, though they would have justified the arrangement, but as the *principalis adversus Judaismum Epistola*.² He held Paul to be distinctively and even exclusively the true apostle, and had none of the scruples which were felt in some degree by other Gnostics in bringing up again the strife at Antioch as the most trenchant argument against the Judaism of the older apostles. The Marcionites were wont to quote this scene as showing that in separating the law and the Gospel Marcion had not set up a new principle, but had simply gone back to the pure and original Gospel.³ His Gnostic dualism necessarily led him to a much more pronounced antithesis to the Old Testament than that of the apostle Paul. His position with regard to the Old Testament did not permit him to resort to allegorical interpretation, since the purpose which it served was to connect the old and the new together, and to reconcile antitheses. Even the apostle Paul made use of allegory for this purpose, which makes it the more remarkable that Marcion rejected it on principle.⁴ But while his Paulinism led him to insist on the breadth and reality of the distinction between the law and the Gospel, it was inconsistent

¹ Cf. Tertullian *adv. Marc.* iv. 1; *Ut fidem instrueret (Marcion evangelio), dotem quandam commentatus est illi (antitheses) praestruendo iv. 6) opus ex contrarietatum oppositionibus antitheses cognominatum et ad separationem legis et evangelii coactum.* Cf. my work, *Die Christliche Gnosis*, Tübingen, 1835, p. 249, *sq.*

² Tertull. *adv. Marc.* v. 2.

³ Tertull. *adv. Marc.* i. 20; *Ajunt, Marcionem non tam innovasse regulam, separatione legis et evangelii, quam retro adulteratam recurasse.*

⁴ Orig. *Comment. in Matth.* xv. 3. *Μαρκίων φίσκων μὴ δεῖν ἀλληγορεῖν τὴν γραφὴν.*

with his ideas to admit distinctions which would introduce division within the sphere of the Gospel itself. We can only regard it as another instance of Marcion's logical application of Pauline universalism, as it led him back to the common evangelical consciousness, which was before all divisions, that he refused in any way to countenance that separation of catechumens from believers, that outward distinction of ranks and classes, in which the foundations of an ecclesiastical constitution moulded after the spirit of the Jewish hierarchy were already beginning to appear.¹ All these features of Marcionitism taken together show it to have been that phenomenon in the early Church in which Paulinism developed its anti-Judaic tendency with the greatest energy. Marcion seems from all accounts to have exercised a remarkable influence upon the Christian Church of the second century. His adherents were widely diffused, and some of them formed Churches of their own not in Rome and Italy alone, but even in the East, and even so late as in the fourth and fifth centuries.² All this is to be attributed to the Pauline element which Marcionitism contained. In proportion as Judaism asserted itself, it was necessary for Paulinism to gather itself together and collect itself in the depths of its own self-consciousness. The expression, however, which it found in Marcionitism was extreme, and it was here brought into association with Gnostic heresy. The inevitable result was that it lost with Marcionitism the position of a great opposition which it had occupied, and forfeited more and more of its importance.

With regard to the opponents against whom Paulinism had to contend after the death of the apostle Paul, one of the earliest writings of the New Testament Canon gives certain indications from which further conclusions may be drawn. Who are the Balaamites or Nicolaitanes whom the Apocalypse attacks so vigorously in its letters to the seven Churches of Asia Minor, and especially in those to the Churches of Pergamos and Thyatira? Besides fornication, they are charged with eating meat offered to

¹ Jerome in his Commentary on Galatians, vi. 6. Cf. Tert. de Praescr. Haer., c. 41.

² Die Christl. Gnosis, p. 297, sq.

idols, Rev. ii. 14-20. Now the question of the lawfulness for Christians of eating such meat had first arisen when members of the Church of Corinth propounded it to the apostle Paul. He had discussed it in its various aspects, and had applied to the question the standard of Christian freedom, and of the enlightened views of a Pauline Christian. His decision on the merits of the question was against the use of such meat, but he allowed of exceptions in certain cases, in which a thing which was in itself inconsistent with Christianity might yet not be regarded as a sin, in consideration of the views or circumstances of the individual. It is extremely probable that many Pauline Christians were led by their more liberal views (the question put to the apostle by the Christians of Corinth shows what the tendency was, 1 Cor. viii. 1, *sq.*) to go further than Paul contemplated, and observed no very strict rule on the point in their intercourse with Gentiles. Thus, in the eyes of Jewish Christians who regarded the apostle Paul with hostility, the eating of meat offered to idols might come to be a distinctive mark of that lax Pauline Christianity which was on such good terms with heathenism. If this was the case, we might see in the above-named passages of the Apocalypse a hostile reference to Pauline Christians generally, without their alleged abuse of their Christian freedom being laid to the door of the apostle himself. But there can be little doubt that the writer had the apostle Paul himself before his eye as the originator of the doctrine out of which this spurious Christianity had sprung, and that he regarded him as a teacher whose apostolical authority was by no means made out. The Judaistic character of the Apocalypse might of itself lead us to this conclusion, but direct evidence is not wanting. In the passage xxi. 14 the author speaks of the twelve apostles, and of their names, corresponding in number to the twelve tribes of Israel, which are written on the twelve foundations of the heavenly Jerusalem; and the context is such as necessarily to exclude the apostle Paul from the number of the apostles. And to whom can the author be referring but to the apostle of the Gentiles and his apostolical assistants, when he

commends the Church of Ephesus, ii. 2, because it could not bear those who said they were apostles, and were not, but tried them and found them false apostles? When we consider the locality to which this passage applies, we see that it gives us important evidence as to the Judaistic reaction against Pauline Christianity. Ephesus, as well as Corinth, had been the residence of the apostle for a considerable time. Here a wide door had been opened to him for his apostolic labours (1 Cor. xvi. 9), and it might have been thought that nowhere was Pauline Christianity established more firmly than in the Churches of Asia Minor, in the midst of which the apostle had lived so long. But at the close of his residence there he had already begun to complain of the many adversaries by whom he was opposed (*in loc. cit.*). There were no doubt Judaistic partisans of the same sort as those at Corinth, and here they had found a still more favourable field for their operations. Not long after the apostle Paul left the sphere of his labours at Ephesus, we meet the apostle John at the same place. The Apocalypse was written, according to its own statement, at or near Ephesus. The tradition of the Church was that he lived here for a long series of years, and presided over the Churches far and near, who looked up to him with the deepest reverence, until he died in an advanced old age. Tradition traced to his teaching those ecclesiastical usages which were peculiar to the Church of Asia Minor. Now when we consider all that we know about the apostle John, the position of antagonism to Paul which he had formerly held as one of the pillar-apostles at Jerusalem, and what the Apocalypse tells us of the character of its writer, and when we take into account that he took up his residence in a quarter where Paul had been before him, can we think it improbable that he came to Ephesus with a view to exercising an influence over the whole district of which it was the centre, and upholding the principles of the Christianity of Jerusalem against the encroachments of the Christianity of Paul? If he hated everything that savoured of heathenism, he would naturally try the Paulinising Churches of the district by this standard; he would ask first of all how far

they were tainted with heathen views or practices. The words of praise or blame which he metes out to them in proportion as they are warm and active, or lukewarm and indifferent in their zeal for pure and genuine Christianity, have but a vague and general meaning, till we see their point and application in the circumstances we have mentioned. Nothing can show more distinctly the wide difference there is between Pauline views and the Johannine views of the Apocalypse, than the conception which the Apocalyptic writer entertains of the whole Gentile world. Heathenism and Judaism are far as the poles asunder in his eyes; heathenism is simply the kingdom of Antichrist, the Gentiles exist only to share the fate of Antichrist! The apostle Paul places side by side with the positive enactment of the Mosaic law, as possessed of equal importance and validity, that law of nature, which is derived from man's natural knowledge of God, and from the moral consciousness whose voice speaks in the conscience. In the one God he sees the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews. The Apocalyptic writer, on the contrary, recognises no such religious instinct or susceptibility as might lead the Gentiles to Christianity: with him each successive plague God sends upon them only makes them more hostile to him, and more blasphemous.¹ With Paul the fulness of the Gentiles enters into the kingdom of God before Israel is converted and receives the fulfilment of the promises. But in the scheme of the Apocalypse all possibility of a historical development is cut off; the catastrophe of the world is to take place in the immediate future, and Judaism is then to celebrate its triumph upon the ruins of the heathen world. After such a proof of Jewish particularism, can we think it strange that John, the writer of the Apocalypse, should, as superintendent of the Churches of Asia Minor, have made war upon Pauline Christianity?

In any case the Christianity which now prevailed in that part of Asia Minor was no longer Pauline, but exclusively Johannine. The Church writers of the period after this belong for the most part to this district; and they either do not mention the name of

¹ Rev. ix. 20; xvi. 9, 11, 21.

the apostle Paul at all, or they speak of him in a hostile sense. *Papias*, who took so much interest in the immediate successors of the apostles, nevertheless does not mention in the celebrated passage where he speaks of these men,¹ either the apostle Paul or any one of his circle. Even in Justin's writings, in many passages of which we should so naturally expect to hear of the apostle Paul, the name never occurs. There can be no doubt that the apostle's writings were widely known when Justin wrote; the Apocalypse of John was well known to him, and he has by no means neglected to speak of it. His strange silence about the apostle Paul and his Epistles certainly suggests to us very forcibly that he meant to ignore them. The first reference to the apostle Paul which we find after this does not testify to a friendly feeling towards him. Hegesippus, a Jewish Christian writer, who lived about the middle of the second century, while not mentioning the apostle's name, refers to the words used by him in 1 Cor. ii. 9, and says they are untrue, and in conflict with divine Scripture, opposing to them the words of Jesus, Matt. xiii. 16. Here he gives utterance to a view regarding the apostolic qualifications of the apostle Paul, which compels us to number him among the apostle's most pronounced opponents. According to the words of Christ in the passage cited, those only are to be called blessed who have seen with their eyes and heard with their ears. This cannot be said of Paul, and accordingly he cannot have been called to be an apostle.² What we know in other ways of the character of this representative of the Jewish Christian party fully bears out this view. Between the years 150-160, he visited foreign Churches as the envoy of that party, and conversed with a number of bishops, among whom those at Corinth and Rome are specially mentioned. From this journey he brought back the satisfactory report that the doctrine prevailed everywhere, according to what was declared by the law, the prophets, and the Lord.³ From this we may conclude, that even in such a Church as that of Corinth the Jewish Christian or Petrine party had gained a decided ascendancy over

¹ Euseb. Eccl. Hist. iii. 39.² Cf. Paul, etc., i. 225.³ Euseb. Eccl. Hist. iv. 22.

the Pauline. In another passage of the same work, all our knowledge of which is derived from the fragments preserved in Eusebius, Hegesippus seems to have spoken of the apostolic age as the time when the Church was still a pure and uncorrupted virgin, and to have dated the entrance of impious error from the time when, after the extinction of the sacred choir of the apostles, the generation of those who had been privileged to hear their divine wisdom with their own ears had passed away.¹

But when we look into this passage we see that it by no means excludes the possibility of there having been even during the lifetime of the apostles such a false teacher as the apostle Paul was in the eyes of these Jewish Christians. What it declares to have ensued upon the death of the apostles was the open appearance of false teachers, with unveiled head, in the Gnosis falsely so called, which opposed the preaching of the truth. But Hegesippus also says that, even during the lifetime of the apostles, there were men who sought indeed to remain in dark concealment, but still were aiming at the perversion of the sound canon of saving doctrine. This seems to be meant for Paul more than any one else. He was not one of those who had heard the heavenly wisdom with his own ears : and little as his mode of action resembled a heresy, which is seeking for concealment, Hegesippus may have applied these terms to it, both because it vanished as it were in darkness before the brightly shining sun of the holy choir of the apostles, and because it did not appear in its true light, as he conceived, till it produced its heretical Gnostic development. The hints of Hegesippus cover a scarcely mistakable personal reference to the apostle Paul. But what he had hinted, others plainly expressed in so many words; we learn that the Ebionites considered him an apostate and false teacher, rejected all his Epistles, and slandered his memory.² The open and outspoken hatred with which the Ebionites regarded him is the extreme point reached by that Jewish Christian opposition to him of which we see the beginnings

¹ Euseb. iii. 32.

² Irenaeus adv. Haer. i. 26. Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. iii. 27. Epiphanius Haer., 30. 25.

in his own Epistles. The Ebionites are generally regarded as mere heretics, but their connection with the original Jewish Christianity is unmistakable. Thus their view of the apostle Paul is no mere isolated phenomenon.

An important source for our further knowledge of these relations is the pseudo-Clementine writings, the Homilies and Recognitions.¹ In these works we become acquainted with the doctrine and spirit of a party which flourished at and after the middle of the second century, and even then presented the most outspoken opposition to Pauline Christianity. The apostle Paul is not mentioned by name, but the reference to him is unmistakable, and the careful reticence of the work on this point only makes its polemical tendency the more marked. In the Epistle which is prefixed to the Homilies, in which Peter sends his sermons to James the bishop of Jerusalem, and recommends him not to communicate them to the Gentiles, but only to the members of the people who adhere firmly to the doctrine of the unity of God, after the mysterious manner of delivery which Moses had followed with regard to the seventy who afterwards sat in his seat, Peter continues: "If this is not done, our doctrine of truth will be divided into a multitude of opinions. I know this not only as a prophet, but because I already see the beginning of the evil. For some of the Gentiles have rejected the lawful preaching which was delivered by me, and have received the lawless and worthless

¹ The relation of these writings to each other and to an older work, a monument of the Petrine party, the *Kήρυγμα Πέτρου*, has lately been the subject of very thorough and elaborate discussion, in which, however, the results of different scholars travel widely apart. See Hilgenfeld, *Die Clementinischen Recognitionen und Homilien nach ihrem Ursprung und Inhalt*, Jena 1848. After him Ritschl took up the subject in his *Entstehung der altkatholischen kirche*, 1st ed. 153, *sq.* Lastly Uhlhorn, *die Homilien und Recognitionen des Clemens Romanus nach ihrem Ursprung und Inhalt*, Göttingen, 1854. Hilgenfeld, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 483, *sqq.* Cf. his *Apostolische Väter Halle*, 1853, p. 287, *sq.* It is specially noteworthy how, as Hilgenfeld has pointed out, the Roman Clemens is introduced at a later stage, on the basis of the original pseudo-Clementine writing. We have here the remarkable fact that this Clemens represents in his own person the progress of that Judaism of the earliest writing, which is so narrow and so exclusive towards all Gentile Christians (*Ep. Petri ad Jac. c. 1. Contest. Jac. c. 1.*) to a more advanced stage.

doctrine of the enemy. And even in my lifetime some have attempted to pervert my words by cunning interpretations to the abolition of the law, as if I myself held such opinions, and did not teach sincerely or honestly; which be far from me. To do this is nothing else than to act against the law of God, which was given by Moses, and attested by our Lord when he said of its permanent duration: 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but one jot or one tittle shall not pass away from the law.' But those who profess to set forth, I know not how, my thoughts, and think they can interpret the meaning of the discourses they have heard from me better than I can myself, say to those who have been instructed by me, that my doctrine and opinion is so and so, a thing which never entered into my mind. If they venture to tell such lies against me while I am still living, how much more will they do so when I am gone?" Who can this enemy have been, whose lawless doctrine is being accepted among the heathen, but the apostle Paul?

It is a curious phenomenon, moreover, that in the Homilies and the Recognitions, Paul appears in the character of Simon Magus, and as a Samaritan. Peter obviously refers to the same person as above, when he says that Simon went to the Gentiles before him, and that he followed and came after him as light comes after darkness, knowledge after ignorance, healing after sickness. As the true Prophet said, it was necessary that the false Gospel should come first, by a false teacher, and that afterwards, after the destruction of the holy place, the true Gospel should be sent forth secretly, for the refutation of future heresies.¹ Still plainer is the reference to the apostle Paul, when we find the apostle Peter arguing with Simon Magus as follows: "Even though our Jesus appeared to thee in a vision, made himself known to thee, and talked with thee, he was wroth with thee as an adversary, and therefore spoke to thee through visions and dreams, or it may be by outward revelations. But can any man be commissioned to the office of a teacher by a vision? And if thou sayest it is possible, why did the teacher go about constantly for a whole year with men

¹ Hom. ii. 17.

who were not dreaming but awake? And how can we believe that he revealed himself to thee? How can he have appeared to thee, who hast opinions which are contrary to his doctrine? If thou really didst become an apostle by his appearing to thee and instructing thee for one hour, then expound his sayings, preach his doctrine, love his apostles, and dispute not with me who was with him! For thou hast striven against me as an adversary, against me, the strong rock, the foundation of the Church! If thou wert not an adversary, thou wouldst not vilify and abuse me and my preaching, so that men will not believe me when I say what I heard from the Lord himself when I was with him; while it is clear that I who am condemned am worthy of praise. If thou callest me worthy of condemnation, thou accusest God who revealed Christ to me, and attackest him who called me blessed on account of this revelation."¹ Here we meet the same charges which the Jewish Christians had brought against Paul from the very first. The great cause of offence is here as it always was, Paul's doctrine of the law. It is said to be a lawless doctrine; it does not bind the Gentiles to observe the law; it asserts that it is possible to be saved without the law. But he who opposes the true apostles by teaching anything so false cannot be a genuine apostle. Thus the attack is directed against the apostle's person. Not only is his apostolic authority expressly denied; but the evidence to which alone he appealed in support of his claim is declared to be radically worthless. It is impossible not to see a pointed reference to the apostle Paul in this sweeping denial of the value of revelations such as he asserted that he had received, conveyed in visions, ecstasies, and dreams, and in the doctrine advanced on the other side, that immediate personal intercourse with Jesus during the whole period of his public ministry is the only way of entrance into the apostolic office, the only criterion of apostolic authority. We see here how hard the Jewish Christians found it to forgive the apostle Paul his conflict with the apostle Peter: for the scene at Antioch is called up again, and the expression turned over which the former had applied to the latter on that occasion.

¹ Hom. xvii. 19.

But how are we to explain this identification of Simon Magus with the apostle Paul? The simplest explanation seems to be that the narrative, Acts viii. 9, of the encounter of the two apostles Peter and John with Simon Magus, received a new application to the apostle Paul. Such a transference would be a very striking proof of the bitter hatred of the apostle which animated the Jewish Christian party, from which the Homilies proceed; though it would not tell us at what time this hatred arose, nor how widely it was diffused among the Jewish Christians. But when we take into consideration the well-known character of the Acts as a historical work, and the likelihood that it was written at a comparatively late period, we are led to ask if the identification may not be accounted for in another way. Instead of the story of Simon having been transferred to Paul, may not the converse have taken place, in which case the magician of the Acts is not the original with whom the apostle was afterwards identified, but we have to look for the source and occasion of the whole legend in the apostle's own history. The historical existence of the Magus must on independent grounds be deemed very doubtful; and a careful consideration of the facts shows him to be nothing but a caricature of the apostle Paul. This theory at once explains to us as nothing else does, both the greatness and the motives of the hatred with which the Jewish Christians pursued the apostle from the very first. All the distinctive features of the Simon of the Acts, and of the legend as afterwards elaborated, answer to definite facts of the apostle's history; and thus not only afford us a glimpse of the process by which the legend first arose, but also furnish us with evidence as to the early times to which the hatred expressed in it is traceable, and the care that was taken to turn everything to account that could serve to give it point.

What the opponents of the apostle considered to be his first and most grievous offence was, as we might have expected, his assertion that the Lord himself had appeared to him, and called him, directly and in a peculiar manner, to be an apostle. This statement appeared to them to be entirely unreasonable and sub-

jective; and at the best, they could only deem it to be a self-delusion, unattested by any objective criterion of truth. It is obviously this charge against the apostle that is represented in the ecstatic, visionary, and fantastic character which is attributed to the Magus. The reference is the same when the Magus is made to express the opinion, that communication by words can produce only an imperfect conviction, because one does not know whether the man who is before one's eyes may not be lying. But a vision, as soon as it is seen, affords the conviction to him who sees it, that it is something divine. In answer to this, the apostle Peter declares, that personal intercourse and continuous instruction by doctrine and example are the true criterion that what is communicated is divine, and asserts the direct opposite of Simon's view, namely, that he who puts his faith in a vision, or an apparition, or a dream, has no certainty, and knows not in whom he is putting his faith. "For it may be that a wicked demon or a deceiving spirit makes that to appear which is not, and if the man asks who it is that has appeared to him, the spirit can answer whatever he pleases. He remains as long as he pleases, and vanishes like a flash of lightning without giving the questioner the information he desires. In a dream one cannot even ask what one wishes to know, since the sleeper has no power over his own mind. It cannot therefore be concluded from a man's seeing visions, dreams, and apparitions, that he is a good man. To receive communications from without by visions and dreams is not the character of revelation at all, but a proof of the divine anger, as it is written in the law (Numbers xii. 6); or else, when a man sees a vision, he must consider that it proceeds from an evil demon."—(Hom. xvii. 13, *sq.*) What had the apostle Paul to urge against all this but the assurance of his own self-consciousness?

But the apostle contended that by the supernatural appearance which had been vouchsafed to him he had not only been converted to faith in Christ, but had also been called to be an apostle. This is a further coincidence between the Magus and the apostle, and indeed the chief one. What the apostle affirmed that he was, the

Magus wished to become. His proposal to the two apostles was simply that they should bestow on him the apostolic office. He desired to have the power of communicating the Holy Ghost, in the same way as the apostles did so, according to the narrative of the Acts, where the communication of the Holy Ghost always follows on the laying on of the apostles' hands. We might have thought that no one could be less suspected than the apostle Paul of having taken this road to the attainment of the apostolic dignity. But what is not possible to the malice of such adversaries as his were? The notion is that he felt his pretensions to be baseless, and as he was determined to be an apostle at any price, tried to obtain the dignity through the older apostles. The facts out of which this charge arose must have been the two conferences which, according to the apostle's own narrative, he held with the older apostles at Jerusalem (Gal. i. 18, and ii. 1), as if his object in coming to Jerusalem had been to smuggle himself into the apostolic college. But this was not enough. The great crime of the Magus, with which the general voice of the Church has aptly identified his name, as the father of simony, was that he sought to procure for himself from the apostles by money and purchase the gift of the Holy Ghost and the spiritual function connected with it, of imparting the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. This Paul was represented to have done. At this point the whole of the cunning web of hateful charges which the apostle's Judaistic opponents had from the first been concocting and disseminating lies clearly revealed to us. The narrative of the Acts does not enable us to form any clear idea of these effects of the apostolic imposition of hands with which the Magus was so much struck, and which led him to seek to obtain the same power. But the history of the apostle gives us the key by which the whole fiction may be explained: The only occasion on which a question of money entered into his relations with the older apostles was when he was leaving them, and promised that he would try to do what he could for the support of the poor of Jerusalem in the Gentile Christian Churches in which he was to labour. When he wrote his

Epistle to the Galatians he was already able to say that he had not neglected this: and his Epistles to the Corinthians contain most interesting evidence of his exertions in the cause. Now is it not clear that when, at the expense of much labour and with the kindest intentions, the apostle had collected this subsidy for the Church at Jerusalem from the Churches of Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia, his opponents put the construction upon his efforts that his object was simply to purchase with this money the favour of the older apostles, and thus to attain at last what he had hitherto sought after in vain, his recognition as an apostle on the same level with the others? Thus we find the figure of Simon Magus, characteristic and striking as it is, to be nothing but a picture of the apostle, distorted in the true spirit of Judaism by his opponents' hatred. There can be no doubt that it was the same spirit which attached the name of Simon Magus to the person of the apostle. He was said to be from Samaria, and to be addicted to magic; this is to be understood in the same sense as a passage in John's Gospel (viii. 48), where, when the hostility of the Jews against Jesus has reached its climax of bitterness, the worst they can find to say of him is that he is a Samaritan, and has a devil. There was no stronger way of saying that Pauline Christianity was heathenish and hostile to the law, than to say that it came from Samaria. The Ebionites regarded the apostle as a Gentile.¹ The Samaritans were not, it is true, actually heathens, they were only half-heathens; but this made the strict and orthodox Jews hate them all the more, seeing in them, as they continually did, not only what was false and perverted in heathenism, but the falsification and defacement of divine truth by heathen errors. Now it is said of Simon Magus in the Homilies, ii. 22, that he denied Jerusalem and set up Mount Gerizim instead. And Hegesippus speaks of the Marcionites, Carpocratians, Valentinians, Basilidians and Saturnilians, as having come forth from the seven Jewish heresies, to

¹ According to Epiphanius, Haer. xxx. 16, they affirmed of him that he was not a Jew by birth, but a Greek or a heathen; that he was born of heathen parents, and became a proselyte to Judaism afterwards.

which the Samaritans also belonged, with Simon Magus at their head, to be false Christs, false prophets, false apostles, and to break up the unity of the Church into sects by their mischievous doctrines.¹ Heathenism was held to be essentially demonic; and where ecstasies and visions played so great a part as in the case of the apostle Paul, it was natural to trace the operation of demonic magic. Now as the undivine puts on the form of magic in order to encounter the divine, so when the magician attempted to get himself made an apostle by impure means, this was the false Simon in contrast with the true, with that Simon Peter who stood at the head of the apostles. But the latter at once saw through his arts, and exposed his hypocrisy publicly and incontestably; just as Paul was said to have exposed Peter at Antioch.

When the fundamental conception of the Magus had thus arisen, it received manifold accretions. Simon became the great father of heretics; to the fantastic imagination of the early writers of the Church he in his own person represented the highest conceptions and views of heathen Gnosticism. In a short time no one had any idea who this Simon Magus had originally been; yet it was not without some reason, it was a theory not at variance with the nature of the case, which used the legend of the Magus to represent Paulinism and Gnosticism as nearly related to each other.² The wanderings of the Magus come to an end in Rome,

¹ Euseb., *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 22.

² The evidence for the assertion that the Simon Magus of the Clementine Homilies is not only Marcion but the apostle Paul has already been set forth by me in my essay on the Christ-party in the Corinthian Church, *Tüb. Zeitschr. für Theol.* 1831, iv. 136, *sq.* For the further criticism of the Simon-legend I may refer to Hilgenfeld, *die Clem. Recogn. und Hom.* p. 319, and to Zeller's *Acts*, T. T. F. L., i. 245, *sq.* Zeller not only gives a critical analysis of the unhistorical narrative in the Acts, but has also strikingly summed up the meaning of the legend in the following words: "If in Acts viii. 18, *sq.*, we substitute the name of Paul for that of Simon, we have a narrative which says in an historical form what, according to 2 Cor. xi. 4, *sq.*, xii. 11, *sq.*; 1 Cor. ix. 1, *sq.*, the anti-Pauline Judaists affirmed as a general truth." But it was Volkmar who first completed the identification by recognising in the magician's offer of money the apostle's subsidy from the western Churches. Cf. *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, p. 279, *sq.*: The Simon Magus of the Acts and the origin of simony. Zeller remarks very correctly,

and he himself is represented as having there met with strange adventures which proved to be the close of his career. The reflection is a faint one; but here also there is a reflection of the history of the apostle of the Gentiles.

p. 266, that "the author, still aware of the meaning of the legend, wished to forestall any application of it to his apostle even by the position in which he placed it" (prior to the conversion of Paul). Here we have another and a very striking proof of the peculiar way in which the author of the Acts made his materials subserve his apologetic designs. He adheres to what is historical, but he places it in a new light, and it receives another form under his hands. He could not ignore the Simon-legend: if he had passed over it in silence, that would have been to leave it in its original meaning, without saying anything against it. He therefore prefers to mention it; but he gives it such a turn as to make it impossible to think of any reference to the apostle Paul. Originally he was Simon; but Simon is now quite a different person, and has nothing to do with Paul. The author of the Acts treated the notorious dispute between the two apostles at Antioch in a similar way. This was a tender spot which it was desirable to avoid. But he did not merely wish to preserve silence on the subject; he wished to draw off attention from it altogether, and so he substituted for it another incident to suggest that something of the sort had happened at the place, but that it was far from being so important as was generally supposed, as Peter had had nothing to do with it: namely, the dispute between Paul and Barnabas, Acts xv. 38. Cf. Gal. ii 13. This, he suggests, was what happened, not the other; he knows of a *παροξυσμός* of apostles at Antioch, and his historical sense does not permit him to ignore it altogether; and yet he does ignore the occurrence as it actually was, and throws a veil of darkness over it.

In this connection it is impossible to avoid thinking of the apostle's journey to Jerusalem, Acts xi. 29, *sq.* On chronological and other grounds it is impossible to assume that the apostle was at Jerusalem during the period in which the Acts places this journey, that is between Gal. i. 18 and ii. 1. On that occasion he is said to have brought a subsidy from the Christians at Antioch to their brethren at Jerusalem. But why does the author of the Acts speak of this subsidy, and so studiously ignore the much more important one which the apostle prepared for his last journey to Jerusalem, and which there can be no doubt that he did carry there? For what other reason than that the latter was the origin of the hateful calumny that was raised against the apostle, which it was now thought desirable to forget? Thus a subsidy was mentioned, because such a thing was notoriously a feature of the apostle's history; and yet it appeared without any of its evil associations; the latter might be forgotten along with the former.

II.—THE RECONCILIATION.

WHEN we survey the series of phenomena which have now been set forth, we are led to ask how it was that the tendencies which we have seen to be so divergent came at last to make terms with each other, and to be embraced in a reconciling unity. Some process of this sort there must have been: otherwise we could not understand how a Catholic Church, a Church which cut off from itself everything extreme, and which united opposites within itself, ever came to exist at all. This result cannot have been reached without a greater or less relaxation, on one side as well as on the other, from the strictness of the antithesis. So much is generally allowed: but a number of questions remain behind, which are by no means settled. How was the process accomplished, on which of the two sides have we to look for the moving principle which led to the reconciliation, what was the attitude of the other party, and in what way are we to group and to classify the different phenomena which form the materials we have here to consider: such are the various elements of the problem to which many scholars who are interested in a deeper investigation of primitive Christianity have recently devoted a large amount of laborious study in various directions. Nor have objections been raised only by those who habitually confront modern criticism with a stiff and lifeless assertion of traditional and obsolete views. Even among those who see that the only hope of obtaining new light upon the obscure relations of this period lies in a keener and more searching criticism, there is still a considerable difference of opinion. Schweigler was the first to make the attempt to construct a new and continuous account of the post-apostolic age on the basis of the new critical theory,

and he did so with great ingenuity and acuteness.¹ Ritschl came forward as a thoroughgoing opponent of Schwegler's views.² To Schwegler's statement of the question, as being to trace the gradual development of Ebionitism into Catholicism, he brought forward the objection that no clear definition was given either of Ebionitism or of Paulinism. He declared that Schwegler "placed Jewish Christianity so low and Paulinism so high as to make it incomprehensible how the belief they had in common could hold the two tendencies together, even outwardly. The mental process by which the religion of the law passed with Paul into the religion of liberty, and the confined and unhappy consciousness was changed dialectically into the assurance of reconciliation, all this has a merely outward connection with the history of Jesus of Nazareth. And thus it is a mere accident that the history of Paulinism and that of Jewish Christianity run together. And this view of the original relation between the two tendencies of early Christianity is fully supported by the very external construction which is given as the historical account of their reconciliation. No inward impulse is recognised, such as would tend to produce communion: and the only account that can be given of the gradual softening of the antithesis is, that unity was seen to be outwardly desirable, and that the literary spokesmen of the parties abandoned one antagonistic element after another, in order to attain it." After this criticism of Schwegler's views, Ritschl of course claims for his own the merit of greater depth and a more correct grasp of the inner connection

¹Das nach-apostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung. Tübingen, 1846.

²Die Entstehung der alt-katholischen kirche, Bonn, 1850. At the same time with Ritschl Köstlin published an essay on the history of primitive Christianity in the Theol. Jahrb. He adopts Planck's Essay on Judaism and Primitive Christianity, Theol. Jahrb. 1847, p. 258, &c., and enters into a new investigation of the historical process and the character of the first two centuries with special reference to Schwegler's account of the period. In this essay he declares himself unable to agree with Ritschl in those results on which the latter lays the greatest stress in his controversy with Schwegler, viz., the assertion that Jewish Christianity contained no element of Christian development. This he says is merely the abstract antithesis to Schwegler's view.

of the development. On closer examination, however, it becomes apparent that if we disregard minor differences the two views are not so far apart from each other as might at first appear. Ritschl as well as Schwegeler proceeds on the assumption that the development of post-apostolic Christianity is in the main to be referred to the Pauline principle. With Schwegeler the reconciliation came to pass by the gradual softening down of the two principles as they acted on each other, and the growth of an inward relation between them. With Ritschl a change takes place in Paulinism which leads to the same result. "The doctrine of the apostle Paul," Ritschl asserts, "presents certain aspects which rendered it inevitable that this principle should be developed in a one-sided way. We must of course take into account the decline of the original religious energy of Christianity among the Christians of the second century; but making all due allowance for this we cannot but conclude that the one-sided development of the Pauline principle was due to a one-sidedness in the expression originally given to it by its author. The confusion of opinion as to the post-apostolic development of the Christian idea is traceable in great part to the fact that no account has been taken of the certainty that the Pauline tendency would pass beyond the form in which its author had given it its original dogmatic expression, and would assume a very different and less dogmatic character. The purer motive which led to this change is to be found in the need which was felt to develop the Pauline principle so as to have it in a form in which it might be a clear, direct, and generally applicable rule of life. With this two outward motives co-operated; one negative, namely, the difficulty and unpopularity of the Pauline dialectic; the other positive, namely, the influence of the evangelical tradition or of the doctrine of Jesus, which had exerted no influence on the formation of the Pauline system."¹ "The change through which Paulinism lost its original form consisted in this, that faith ceased to be subjective faith in the atoning death of Christ apart from the law; it was faith in a wider sense, in its relation to God; to it was added the observ-

¹ Ritschl, *op. cit.*, 23, 280, 89.

ance of the divine will, or of the law of Christ, as a means of justification, redemption, and salvation in a legal sense : and in spite of the original Pauline formula, this factor came largely : preponderate over faith. Thus we no longer hear of redemption through the death of Christ in Paul's sense : we hear of love, of the disposition for good works, as the means of obtaining the forgiveness of sins." Now this is essentially the same as the formula *πίστις καὶ ἀγάπη* which Schwegeler regards as the term of the development of Paulinism and the basis of the reconciliation of the two parties. But, according to Ritschl, Paulinism is so radically one-sided that the direct and generally applicable rule of life which came in place of it could not have proceeded out of it by inner development, but only *per saltum*. Thus we find with him the same outward relation of the elements of the two tendencies which he blames in Schwegeler. Again, Ritschl asserts that the Pauline system was formed quite independently of the teaching of Jesus ; and we scarcely see what right he has to condemn Schwegeler for having "given a reading of Paulinism according to which it is not derived from the inner spirit of the life of Jesus, or, in fact, from any idea whatever that the influence of Jesus had brought before the world."¹ Nor can Ritschl's assertion be sustained, that the evangelical tradition or the doctrine of Jesus influenced the later modification of Paulinism of which he speaks through the Gospel of Luke. He himself assumes,² that the representation of the Gospel history given in Luke is merely the reflection of original Paulinism. The more closely Ritschl's account of the history is analysed, the more does it appear to resolve itself into antitheses which are without any thread of connection to explain their development. On the one side stands Jewish Christianity with the assertion, Christianity is the old law. On the other side stands Paulinism with the contrary assertion, Christianity is subjective faith in Christ without the law. In Jewish Christianity it is said there was no inner power of development ; the motive principle is to be found in Paulinism. But neither can the latter develop itself by a

¹ Page 20.² Page 300.

natural process ; it is too hard and one-sided to produce out of itself a direct and generally applicable rule of life. Paulinism is, it is true, the tendency which stands higher : but we must not shut our eyes to what can be said for Jewish Christianity. "For the assumption that Paulinism is perfect in the orthodox sense, and that there is no gap in the system, is one we cannot adopt, were it only out of respect for the Christianity of those apostles who remained Jewish."¹ Thus neither of the two tendencies is absolutely true ; each has its justification as against the other. Now Ritschl asserts that "Jesus neither intended to declare, nor actually did declare any opposition to Mosaism in essential points, and his doctrine was, in virtue of this very feature, the immediate basis of Jewish Christianity as differing in principle from Paulinism."² If that be so, then Ritschl gives us little help towards understanding how the dogma and the wide-branching organism of the Catholic Church can have arisen out of the thought that Jesus was the Messiah, a thought which could appeal to none but Jewish minds. Nor, when we come to the point, can we surmount the doubt whether Jesus or Paul was the true author of Christianity.³ We are told that in the view of Christianity as a law, in the conception of the new law in which those who are universally allowed to be the representatives of the early Catholic Church, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clemens of Alexandria, and Origen agree with Justin Martyr, there is exhibited to us the relation of the Catholic Church to the apostolic types of doctrine, the Jewish Christian and the Pauline ; and the result is said to be that this side of Catholicism is based, not on Jewish Christianity, as from its direct opposition to Pauline principles we might have expected, but on the Pauline tendency.⁴ But if the altered form of the latter was due simply to the external motive which we have mentioned, and did not arise out of the essence of Paulinism itself, then we cannot say that the development into Catholicism was based mainly on the Pauline tendency ; it may equally well have arisen on the basis of Jewish Christianity. What is said to be the characteristic of Catholic Christianity, viz.,

¹ Page 23.² Page 300.³ Page 19.⁴ Page 327.

the co-ordinateness of faith and practical activity or the doing of works, stands in a very natural connection with the character of the Old Testament religion. And finally, Ritschl's account of early Christianity takes no notice of the personal relations between the apostles Peter and Paul. But it was on this ground that the antithesis of the two tendencies first appeared, and came to the sharpest and directest expression which it ever had; and it was on this ground that an accommodation was arrived at, which serves as the clearest landmark we can have to show the complete transition of the divergent tendencies into that unity where all antitheses and extremes were at last atoned.¹

In what we have said of Ritschl's work we have briefly indicated the principal points with which we have now to deal, and without due attention to which our discussion would fail to accomplish its object, which is to follow the historical development of the different antitheses as they act and re-act upon each other.

¹ In the second edition (Bonn, 1857), Ritschl's work has been entirely recast. This edition appears as a recantation of the first. The author announces that he has now reached a position so far removed from that of the Tübingen school as to make him an opponent of their whole system on essential points (Preface, p. 5). But the difference between him and that school is not so radical and thorough as he asserts: nor can the entire recast of the work be deemed a step in advance. His new position merely produces a larger array than formerly of contradictions and inconsistencies in his conception and delineation of early Christianity. The new view of the relation of Jesus to the law is the direct opposite of his former view, and this is an improvement; but the great defect of the original work remains unchanged; namely, the entire externality with which the antitheses confront each other, and their want of any inner and vital development. There is no fundamental difference, it is said, between the original apostles and Paul: and yet there does remain between them the fundamental difference of Jewish particularism and Pauline universalism. So little is there any living principle of historical movement, that Jewish Christianity and Paulinism are actually declared to be equally incapable of any further development, p. 271, *sq.*, 282. On this and on other works bearing on this question which have recently appeared, compare my work: *Die Tübinger Schule und ihre Stellung zur Gegenwart*, Tübingen, 1859. It was occasioned by Uhlhorn's essay in the *Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie*, 1858, p. 280, *sqq.*; *Die älteste kirchengeschichte und die Darstellung der Tübinger Schule*. See also Hilgenfeld in the *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1858. *Das Christenthum und seine neuesten Bearbeitungen von Lechler und Ritschl*. He says very correctly, p. 381, that with Ritschl as with Lechler the development of Gentile Christianity and Jewish Christianity into Catholicism appears to be the work of blind chance.

The point of departure lies in the antitheses already pointed out : the result is that they are accommodated to each other, and disappear. In the interval between these two extremes, there must be steps of reconciliation ; and from the nature of the case nothing is more probable than that the movement towards unity proceeded, not from one side only, but from both, of course in different ways. We should expect to find that both parties, feeling more or less distinctly that they belonged together, act upon each other in the living process of development, each party modifying the other, and being modified by it in turn. Without such a process, the result, as it lies before us in history, the appearance of a Christian Catholic Church, could never have come to pass at all. But would this process have been possible if the two parties, Gentile Christians and Jewish Christians, had continued to present to each other an attitude of unyielding and repellent opposition, if Jewish Christianity in its various forms had been incapable of further development, and if, on the side of Paulinism, what bridged over the gulf between Catholic and Apostolic Christianity had been simply the incapacity of the Gentile Christians to understand Paul ? Can this have been what led them to Catholic Christianity, that the fundamental conceptions of the apostles as to the new basis of the religious relation which God hath provided in Christ were only intelligible by the help of the Old Testament, and that they could not reproduce them to themselves in a correct and living way ? It is a complete mistake, and will altogether prevent us from seeing these relations as they were, if we suppose that the point at issue between the two opposing parties was one of difference in doctrine ; that the question was whether the relation between the Jewish doctrine of the law and the Pauline doctrine of faith should be formulated in this way or in that. It is in vain to seek for the principle of the movement within the sphere of abstract ideas, as if union would ensue when they came to regard each other with indifference. From such a combination no new or vigorous life could possibly proceed. The principle of the movement is to be sought in the concrete centre where questions were

arising which pressed for an answer: where Christianity, set in the midst of the great forces of the age, had still to struggle for a place among them and assert its own right to exist, and had, at the same time, to create the forms within which its historical development was to proceed.

When Paulinism and Jewish Christianity first came to stand in open opposition to each other, we find the motive power in those Judaists who met the apostle Paul with an uncompromising resistance at every point of his sphere of labour. There is no stronger proof of the capacity for development which was inherent in Judaism, than the undeniable fact that it found no difficulty in giving up even those positions which it had defended with the greatest zeal, as soon as it became apparent that such a course would help it to a more effective assertion of its preponderance over Paulinism. This is the only possible explanation of the fact that baptism all at once appears in the place of circumcision. At first the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem asserted in absolute terms the necessity of circumcision, and demanded that the Gentiles also should submit to that rite, and we have no reason to assume that the older apostles did not originally share this view. In the Epistle to the Galatians the apostle's Jewish Christian opponents are still insisting on circumcision as the absolute condition without which there can be no salvation. But after this where do we hear of the Jewish Christian party as a whole continuing to make this demand, as a matter of principle? Even the pseudo-Clementine writings do not mention circumcision as an essential article of Judaism. Only here and there is there a hint of the importance which had been attached to it formerly, as in the directions given in the *Contestatio* about the writings sent by Peter to James, that they should only be communicated to a good and pious believer who was prepared to teach, and circumcised. From this we may justly infer that the Jewish Christians themselves gave up the necessity of circumcision, a fact which can only be explained by supposing that, as they saw large and increasing numbers of Gentiles converted without submitting to circumcision, they came to feel it to be simply impossible to

insist upon a point which the history of Gentile Christianity had practically settled. How they reconciled this with their view of the necessity of the observance of the law, we need not now inquire; in any case, we cannot but regard it as a concession made by them to Pauline universalism. And it seems to be closely connected with this, that, as circumcision ceases to be mentioned, baptism now becomes invested with a religious significance similar to that of circumcision. It was, of course, necessary to have some form or other for the admission of Gentiles to the Messianic community, and what form could be more suitable for the purpose than baptism? There can be no doubt that its general introduction and its higher religious significance are very closely connected with the conversion of the Gentiles. Even the apostle Paul seems to indicate as much, when, writing at a time at which circumcision was made an indispensable condition of salvation, he declares baptism to be the condition of communion with Christ (Gal. iii. 27). "Whoever," he says, "has been baptized into Christ, has put on Christ, and there is no longer any difference between Jew and Gentile." Thus, as circumcision makes a Jew, so baptism makes a Christian. Again in Matt. xxviii. 19, the commandment of baptism which there can be no doubt belongs to the last recension of the Gospel, stands in the closest connection with the injunction to convert all nations. From the nature of the case, baptism would originally bear this meaning only for the Gentiles; but we see from the pseudo-Clementine Homilies how Jewish Christians came to look upon it in the same light. That work only calls baptism the means ordained by God for the putting off of heathenism (*ἀφ'ελληνισθῆναι*), but at the same time regards it as the necessary condition on which alone man can attain the forgiveness of his sins and future blessedness.¹ Thus circumcision was given up by the Jewish Christians as soon as there came to be another form of attaining the assurance of salvation which they could allow to be equally significant. In the case of the Gentile Christians, baptism was naturally and at once regarded as a substitute for circumcision. Jewish Christians

¹ Hom. xiii. 9, 11, 13.

were Jews by birth, and did not need any such substitute, but the number of born Jews who adopted Christianity was constantly decreasing, and so baptism came more and more to be the universal form of making the Christian confession, and to be considered the characteristic mark of the Christian, as circumcision was of the Jewish, religion.¹ We see then that it was on the question of circumcision that the absolute power of Judaism first gave way. It is true that there still continued to be Jewish Christians, who not only continued to regard the law as absolutely binding on themselves, but even declined all fellowship with Gentile Christians who did not observe the law as they did. But this was the more rigid type, and there was another class of Jewish Christians, holding less extreme opinions, who made no such demand on Gentile Christians, and who nevertheless recognised them as Christian brethren.² Yet even this class of Jewish Christians could not altogether release the Gentile Christians from the observance of the law. The obligation of the law must not be cast off altogether; and so those ordinances, at least, were to remain in force, which the author of the Acts gives as the decrees of his alleged apostolic council. It has long been shown,³ that the apostles cannot have drawn up these

¹ According to the Recognitions baptism came in the place of the sacrifice, which had now been discontinued (i. 39). *Ut tempus adesse coepit, quo id, quod deesse Moysis institutis diximus, impleretur, et propheta quem praecinuerat, appareret, qui eos primo per misericordiam Dei moneret cessare a sacrificiis, et ne forte putarent, cessantibus hostiis remissionem sibi non fieri, baptismum eis per aquam statuit.* In this view baptism acquired religious significance for the Jewish Christian also, who from his Jewish birth required no compensation for the loss of circumcision. This view is, there can be no doubt, of Essenic-Ebionitic origin. The religious washings of the Essenes, to which they attributed power to purify and to release from sin, rested on their rejection of the Mosaic sacrificial worship: which explains in a very natural way how, among the Elkesaites, the baptism which procured the forgiveness of sins was capable of repetition. Cf. Ritschl *Zeitschr. für Hist. Theol.* 1853, p. 582, *sq.*; *alkath. Kirche.*, 2d ed., p. 188; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.*, 1858, p. 422, *sq.* The fact that baptism is here connected with sacrifice (see on the passage of the Recognitions Uhlhorn, *op. cit.*, 251; Ritschl, *alkath. Kirche*, 2d ed., 239) is in any case perfectly consistent with the assumption that baptism was what actually came in the place of circumcision.

² Cf. Justin Dial. c. Jud. Tryph. c. 47.

³ See my "Paul, etc.," i. 131. Zeller's Acts, ii. 27, *sqq.*

decrees as we now have them ; and that what they contain is that minimum of the demands of the law, which the Jewish Christians required from the Gentile Christians, when experience had shown what was practicable, and might be asked. The conditions are the same as those on which the Israelites admitted proselytes of the gate into their communion. (Leviticus xvii. 8, 16 ; xviii. 26.)¹ This shows us how the Jewish Christians adhered to the standpoint of the law in this matter, and recognised no other standard for their relations towards the Gentile Christians than that provided in the law for the regulation of the intercourse of Jews with Gentiles. But, on the other hand, they had now conceded the very utmost that could be conceded to Gentile Christians by Jewish Christianity. If the Gentile Christians would only observe these provisions, there was no further obstacle to prevent that free intercourse of Jewish and Gentile Christians, which the question of circumcision had formerly threatened to render quite impossible. As soon as they could look upon the Gentile Christians as proselytes of the gate, the Jewish Christians felt that their objections to them were removed. And this is an instance of how all that Jewish Christianity required, in order to enter into friendly relations with Paulinism, was frequently nothing more than a way of putting the case, so as not to jar upon the religious susceptibilities of the Jewish Christian. In fact, when there had come to be a new Christian world outside of Judaism, and quite independent of it, when this had become a matter of fact, which could not be questioned or undone, the Jewish Christians would gladly have laid claim to the whole of Pauline universalism, had its originator only been Peter instead of Paul. Indeed Pauline universalism was actually taken from Paul and given to Peter. This is the only possible reading of the fact, that in the pseudo-Clementine writings Peter is the apostle of the Gentiles, whose mission it is, "to travel to the nations who say that there are many gods, and to preach and teach them that there is only one God, who has made heaven and earth, and all that in them is, that by loving Him they might be

¹ Cf. Ritschl, *op. cit.* 117, *sq.*, 2d. ed., 129, *sq.*

saved.”¹ The same circle in which Paul travelled as a missionary among the nations is in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies described by the apostle Peter : he also, as an apostle to the Gentiles, must go on from city to city, from land to land, and can finish his career nowhere but at Rome.² It is true that in his mission to the Gentiles Peter is here represented as undoing the mischief wrought by an adversary : he follows on the steps of Simon Magus, to confute his false doctrine, and convert the nations from it to the doctrine of the true prophet : he is merely labouring to repair the ravages which the false apostle has made before him. This, however, is only the external form to cover the claim which the Jewish Christians put forth on behalf of their apostle to the work and merit of the apostle of the Gentiles. They are perfectly willing to accept the facts such as they had now come to be : they are well aware that the time is now past when a demand could be made on the Gentiles which would render it impossible, or even difficult, for them to enter into the Messianic kingdom. The conversion of the Gentiles is an accomplished fact, and it is useless to dispute it ; it must be accepted, since it has so come about. But it could not be allowed that this was due to the labours of an apostle not recognised by the authority of the Jewish Christian apostles. It was desirable to show that the condition had been complied with which those opponents of the apostle, with whom we are acquainted from his own Epistles, had at the very outset declared in their doctrine and their acts to be indispensable before the conversion of the Gentiles could be held to have been lawfully accomplished. To accomplish this end, and at the same time to set aside the true apostle of the Gentiles, and bring him into utter oblivion, so that not even his name should go down to posterity, he is supplanted by another, a man who could not fail to be the object of universal hatred and detestation. For the name of Paul there is substituted

¹ Hom. iii. 59. Cf. *Recogn.* iii. 56 ; vii. 7 ; x. 16.

² Cf. the Epistle of Clement to James, c. 1, where it is said of Peter that he τῆς δόσεως τὸ σκοτεινότερον τοῦ κόσμου μέρος ὡς πάντων ἰκανώτερος ἐφώτισα· κελυσθεῖς καὶ κατορθῶσαι δυνηθεῖς—μέχρις ἐνταῦθα τῇ Ῥώμῃ γενόμενος θεοβουλίῳ διδασκαλίᾳ σώζων ἀνθρώπους, αὐτὸς τοῦ νῦν βίου βιαιῶς τὸ ζῆν μετήλλαξεν.

that of a false teacher; and the victory obtained over this false teacher secures to the legitimate apostle the credit of what the illegitimate and false apostle was formerly supposed to have done. The bitter and deadly hatred with which the pseudo-Clementine Homilies reproduced and exaggerated the old odious charges against the apostle Paul testifies unmistakably to a desire to extinguish his name from the memory of men. In no other way can we explain why such charges should be dwelt on at a period when to the greatest part of the Christian world the whole dispute had become a thing of the past. And this is the more remarkable, when we consider the character and position of Clement, the important personage of these writings. He is of Gentile birth, and the first-fruits of all the Gentiles converted by the apostle Peter;¹ and as such he is the natural mediator between Jewish and Gentile Christians. But he is also thoroughly versed in Hellenic culture;² it is in this way that the religious interest has been awakened in him which leads him to Christianity, and brings him into the closest relations with the apostle Peter. Thus he represents that more spiritual Christianity which took up into itself all the better elements it found in Paganism. Nay, even in the historical narrative in which these writings are framed we find Christianity presented to us as the religion which brings about the union of everything that is noble in human nature, where the separated and those who have wandered on the most widely different paths, meet again, find themselves to be members of one and the same family, and in virtue of their common human nature akin to one another; so that they at once attain peace of soul, and the most perfect assurance with regard to all the dispensations of life.³ How does all this agree with the irreconcilable antipathy manifested in these writings towards the apostle Paul?⁴

¹ Ep. Clem. ad Jac. c. 3.

² Hom. i. 3; iv. 7. Κλήμης—πάσης ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας ἐξηκησμένος.

³ Cf. Die Christliche Gnosis, p. 372, sq. Hilgenfeld, die apost. Väter, p. 297, sq.

⁴ From the account we have given of the origin of the legend of Simon, it is evident that this keen antipathy to the apostle Paul is not to be accounted for by saying that it is a curious feature of these writings, and peculiar to them. In

In any case the circumstance proves the energy of Jewish Christianity. It left no expedient untried; it would use any means in order to maintain its claim of superiority against Paulinism, and not suffer the supremacy over the Gentile world to pass to other hands. And in fact, were we to disregard this episode altogether, and to judge by the historical results alone, we could not estimate too highly the influence of Jewish Christianity on the formation of the Christian Church. It is indeed in the renewal of its youth, when it developed into Jewish Christianity, that Judaism appears before us in the full splendour of its historical significance. For whence were all those theocratic institutions and aristocratic forms derived, in which the Catholic Church found ready to her hand the elements of her future organisation, and which contained in themselves all the conditions of a power that should conquer the world, whence but from Judaism? The true centre and living pillar of Catholicism, the organising and animating principle of the whole body corporate, is the episcopate. Now the early idea of the episcopate was, that the bishop was to be to the individual community of Christians, concretely and visibly, what the Jewish Messianic idea in its Christian development represented Christ as being for the Church general in his heavenly dignity. And thus in the first beginnings of the episcopal constitution we see before us the whole papal hierarchy of the middle ages. Here is the boundless capacity for development which belonged to Jewish Christianity, the impulse inherent in Judaism towards a theocratic empire of the world. This impulse displays the same energy inwardly in the tenacity with which it adheres to its own peculiar principle, and outwardly in its vigorous expansion and assertion of its place as a great power in the world. It was Paulinism that conquered the

marked contrast with their exclusiveness and one-sidedness towards the apostle Paul are the breadth and liberality with which the Homilies insist on the practical side of Christianity as the most important. Indeed, the universalism of Christianity is here flattened out into a doctrine, according to which there is no difference between Jewish and Gentile Christians, or even between Jew and Gentile, if only they do what is commanded them, and do not hate him whom they do not know. Hom. viii. 4; xi. 16. *Die Chr. Gnosis*, p. 363, sq.

soil for Catholic Christianity: it was the Pauline mission to the Gentiles which added to the original congregation of the sealed the great multitude of those who came from all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues.¹ But it was Jewish Christianity which supplied the forms of organisation and erected the hierarchical edifice upon this basis.

But great as the influence of Jewish Christianity was in this direction, Paulinism was able to assert on its side the right it had won, and even the superiority of its principle. When Paulinism rebutted the aristocratic claims of Jewish particularism, and destroyed the very root from which these claims sprang, it made the principle of Christian universalism an integral element of the general Christian consciousness. It thus secured for itself, for the whole future of the Church, the power to step forward again and again with all its original keenness and decision, whenever hierarchical Catholicism should again overgrow evangelical Christianity, and offend the original Christian consciousness in its most vital element. In every case of this sort men were driven back to those simple and fundamental truths by which the apostle Paul, taking his stand upon the moral consciousness itself, had shown that there was no difference between Jew and Gentile before God. In the transition to the Catholic Church Paulinism, as has been justly said,² developed into a universal rule of life, in which the doctrine of justification receded more and more into the background, while faith began to go hand in hand with works. This, however, is not to be regarded as a renunciation of the Pauline principle; it is not a declension or a reaction, if we understand rightly the relation in which the apostle himself placed faith and works to each other.³ Paulinism only presents its sharp doctrine of justification by faith in its most incisive mode of statement when it has to contend with Jewish Christianity for the ground of its existence, and for its

¹ Rev. vii. 9.—Here in a genuinely aristocratic and hierarchical spirit the Jews are arranged according to the twelve tribes of Israel, and each has his own number and place: the Gentiles are merely the great uncounted multitude.

² P. 101.

³ Cf. my *Abhandlung über den Römerbrief*, p. 184: Works and Faith.

warrant on grounds of principle. It was the energy with which the apostle fought this battle which alone enabled Paulinism to assert itself against the still overwhelming power of Jewish Christianity. But as soon as this end had been attained, Paulinism was quite at liberty to concede to works their proper place by the side of faith. The apostle had himself recognised the moral value of works, and had spoken not of a mere abstract faith, but of a faith working through love. The mistake was only that Paulinism did not at once come forward to assert its doctrine of justification as outspokenly as before, whenever Jewish Christianity began to threaten new encroachments in any direction. Even in the post-apostolic age such a case had arisen, when the Church was proceeding to assume its hierarchical constitution.

We have now indicated the principle, in the light of which we have to conceive the inner relations of those elements of Christianity during this period of its historical development, elements which certainly differ from each other essentially, and yet are essentially connected. Our further task is now to place under this point of view those canonical writings which stand nearest to the apostolic age, and to inquire what relation they bear to the one side or the other of this process of reconciliation; whether their conciliatory tendency bears a more Pauline or a more Judaistic character; and whether the ideas and views which they contain are such as refer to special and subordinate parts of the great question, or such as look away from particulars, and seek to establish on broader grounds the necessity of a reconciliation in which all differences should be united and harmonised.

Among the writings which we have here to consider, the Epistle to the Hebrews is undoubtedly entitled to the first place, both in point of chronology, and from its subject-matter.

A great part of the early Church reckoned this work among the Pauline Epistles, and this testimony makes it exceedingly probable that the Epistle, though not composed by the apostle himself, is yet a product of Paulinism. The author himself seems anxious to create this impression; his express mention of the brother Timothy

(xiii. 23) must be intended to mark his Epistle as one proceeding from the apostle Paul's immediate circle. The author's style of thought, however, is that of one holding firmly to the standpoint of the ancient chosen people; and when we consider the spirit and the tendency of the Epistle, we cannot doubt that it is a product not of Paulinism, but of Jewish Christianity. This statement, however, requires to be modified, inasmuch as it is not the old, harsh, and exclusive Jewish Christianity, to which this Epistle owes its origin, but a Jewish Christianity more free and spiritual, which is broad enough to have Paulinism itself as a pre-supposition. Though we nowhere find in the Epistle the specifically Pauline ideas and doctrinal formulas, yet it contains nothing antagonistic to them. It does not expressly identify itself with Pauline universalism, but neither does it do so with Jewish particularism; on the contrary, it is quite at one with the apostle Paul in the view that Judaism belongs to a very subordinate, imperfect, and transitory stage of religious development, and is to be succeeded by a higher and more perfect dispensation which will last for ever. Thus the antitheses here are, generally speaking, the same as those in which the apostle Paul feels himself placed. There is this remarkable difference, however, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews at once proceeds to give a mode of reconciling the antitheses, in which he seems to take up a higher position than Paul. This is not altogether the case: what he does is simply to find in Judaism itself the broader conception in the light of which the antitheses may be reconciled. This conception is in a word the priesthood. Christ is essentially a priest, Judaism has also its priesthood; and thus everything that either distinguishes Judaism from Christianity, or unites them together, may be referred to the nature of the priesthood. This view at once blunts the edge of the antithesis which has to be adjusted. It is no longer an antithesis of things directly opposite and excluding each other, such as that of faith and the works of the law, but one which, notwithstanding the deep significance that lies in it, yet admits of being approached as a relative opposition and one of degree. The

two members of the antithesis are merely the perfect and the imperfect priesthood: Judaism is essentially the same as Christianity: it contains imperfectly and defectively that which arrives at perfection in Christianity.

But the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews does not stop here. He has something to place above both the imperfect and the perfect priesthood, which embraces both the members of the antithesis in a higher unity. This is the priesthood of Melchisedek. The priesthood of Melchisedek stands above the Levitical priesthood, and the difference between the priesthood of Christ and the Levitical priesthood is simply that Christ is a priest after the order of Melchisedek.¹ In thus reverting to an Old Testament standpoint which lies beyond Levitical and Mosaic Judaism, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems merely to be following the example of the apostle Paul. Paul placed the faith of Abraham above the law and the righteousness of the law, and saw in the faith which Christians now had the fulfilment of the early promise given to Abraham. But here there is a great difference between the two writers. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews places the priesthood of Melchisedek, the Levitical priesthood, and that of Christ all in one line: here it is evident that continuity is a part of the idea which runs through his scheme. The apostle Paul, on the contrary, interposes the law between the promise given to Abraham on the one side, and its fulfilment in Christ on the other, and it is hard to see why the law should come in in this way. It appears to be there for no end but to keep the promise and the fulfilment apart. The apostle himself speaks of it as a thing quite adventitious. He says that the law was given because of transgressions, that sin might have its full course (Gal. iii. 19), and this appears to amount to declaring a complete rupture with the Judaism of the law. From the point of view of the Epistle to the Hebrews, there is no opening for any such idea. It is completely excluded by the notion of the priesthood: a notion which was quite outside the apostle Paul's circle of ideas. To the apostle

¹ Heb. iv. 14; v. 6; vi. 20; vii. 1.

Judaism is essentially law, and what he sees in the law is chiefly its negative relation to Christianity. What the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews advances against the law, for he does call it fleshly, weak, and unprofitable, because it brings nothing to perfection (vii. 16, *sq.*), acquires quite another meaning from the fact that the idea of the priesthood underlies all that he says. He himself marks very happily the difference of his point of view from that of the apostle Paul, when he says, vii. 12, that "the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." The priesthood is thus in his eyes the primary element, the starting-point in considering the whole subject: the law is a secondary thing, and the latter must adjust itself to the former. The idea of the priesthood has so high and absolute a significance for him, that it determines his whole view of the world and conception of Christianity.

But we shall fail to see the full and solid significance which this idea had for our author, if we do not regard it as discovering to us that relation of type and antitype which is one great condition of his thought. The priest after the order of Melchisedek and his identity with Christ are the principal instance of type and antitype, but everything belonging to the sphere of the Old Testament religion has an ideal, typical, symbolical meaning with reference to Christianity. In the typical, however, we have again to distinguish between the archetype and the copy. Actual Judaism is merely the copy, the shadow, the reflection, of an archetypal religion standing above it, from which such primary types as the high priest Melchisedek project into it. What Christianity is in its true essence, what distinguishes it from Judaism, is ideally and essentially present in those archetypes. Thus Judaism, the actual, legal, Levitical Judaism, standing as it does between the Old Testament religion, which is ideal Christianity, and historical Christianity, can only be regarded as the declension from the idea, as the shadow of the idea, the provisional and untrue form of the true religion which is still concealed; the form through which the idea has to move before it can attain to its true historical realisa-

tion, its consummation in Christianity. Thus the whole history of the world and of religion is the process of the idea of religion, which, moving through Judaism and Christianity as its steps, in Christianity is filled with its concrete contents. In the apostle's view of the world, Adam and Christ, or the first and second Adam, possess in "the man from heaven" (1 Cor. xv. 47) an archetypal unity in a region above the antithesis. This unity bears some analogy to that found in Melchisedek. Other antitheses through which the process moves in the apostle's view are those of sin and grace, death and life. From the standpoint of the Epistle to the Hebrews, this process is represented as that of the archetype, realising itself by means of its type or copy. The distinction between the two views may thus be said to be that the tendency of the one is ethical, and that of the other metaphysical. In seeking to comprehend the relation between Judaism and Christianity from the standpoint of a higher and more comprehensive view of the world, Paul and the author of this Epistle are entirely at one; but in all the principal points they take up they follow different paths. A matter which to the apostle Paul's mind has the profoundest inward and subjective importance, and reaches down to the very depths of the moral consciousness, is to the author of this Epistle a purely theoretical question, which he is able to sum up in the reflection that it is a contradiction of the objective view of the world which he has set forth to prefer the imperfect to the perfect, the mere shadow to the substance of the thing itself. With all the moral conceptions which belong to the Pauline anthropology, the power of sin which renders the fulfilment of the law impossible, the power of the flesh over the spirit, and the consequent universality of sin, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is entirely unacquainted. The death of Christ is indeed a sacrifice for atonement, but Christ is not the one who has died for all, inasmuch as all died in him. With the apostle there are no other sacrifices of atonement for sins; he even reckons the sacrifices of the Old Testament among the works of the law. The Epistle to the Hebrews, on the contrary, thinks it all-important to

compare the sacrificial institutions of the Old Testament with the sacrificial death of Christ, with a view to show that although Judaism did in its own way contain every essential element of religion, yet Christianity possesses the same in a much better and more perfect way. The symbolism being carried out in this spirit, the two worships are brought so near each other that though the difference in quality cannot from the nature of the case be mistaken, yet in each instance it nearly disappears and leaves the quantitative difference in the foreground.¹ This effort to prove an analogy and show that the one *cultus* contained already all that is in the other, has of course the result of generalising and flattening out the specific Pauline ideas. This is most notably the case with the conception of faith, when we find that the same saving faith existed under the old covenant as under the new, xi. 1, *sq.*, and that the contents of faith are simply that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek him, xi. 6. 26.

Thus the relation of type and antitype, on the basis of the genuinely Jewish idea of the priesthood, is the determining principle of the view of the world set forth in this Epistle. A further and most important point in his peculiar conception of Christianity is that the relation of type and antitype is equivalent to the relation of the present and the future world. It is a part of the fundamental conception of the Epistle, that in the present world of time there is nothing true or lasting, that only in the future world does everything come to perfection. But as only that can be perfected which has in itself the principle of perfection, everything may ultimately be reduced to the antithesis of the heavenly and the earthly. The heavenly is the perfect, the self-existent, the true, archetypal being, ix. 11, 24, x. 1; and since the type is now in possession in place of the archetype, and the present world is but the reflection of the archetypal, it is only in the future world

¹ Hence the constantly recurring comparatives, Christianity is an *ἐπεισαγωγή κρείττονος ἐλπίδος*, a *κρείττων διαθήκη*, vii. 19, 22. Christ has a *διαφορωτέρα λειτουργία*, etc., viii. 6, he came *διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς*, ix. 11, his sacrifices are *κρείττονες*, ix. 23, etc.

that all things can attain to reality. Christianity also has no reality but there: it is identical with the future world (ii. 5, vi. 5), and so far is the author of the Epistle from allowing it to obtain any firm footing on the quaking ground of this transitory world of time, xii. 27, that he even transfers the act of the atonement from the present world to the future, and represents Jesus as having died here merely in order to have the blood which he requires in order to enter heaven as the great high priest. This is not Paulinism: but it is Alexandrinism. The Alexandrine idealism obviously governs the whole style of thought of the Epistle. All the antitheses to which this view of the world gives rise are at the same time statements of the relation between Judaism and Christianity. They are related as archetype and type, as the heavenly and the earthly, as the absolute and the finite, or, since the absolute itself must enter into the finite, and can only be through the mediation of the finite, that which it is to be—as the present and the future world. From the standpoint of Alexandrine idealism, the temporal earthly world is only a vanishing momentum of the essential ideal world. Such accordingly is the relation of Judaism and Christianity to each other. Judaism being the religious constitution of this actual finite world, is advancing towards the dissolution which is appointed for it: it is from its very nature that which is decaying and waxing old and ready to vanish away, viii. 13. Christianity exists in the present world only in so far as it reaches over from the ideal and future world into this one, and manifests itself to subjective perception in the powers of the world to come, vi. 5. In the death of Christ the two worlds are separated, but as Judaism still subsists, and Christianity with its true being has not yet come, the present world is a mixed state of Judaism and Christianity. In each of them the other also is seen, but only figuratively, in a more or less dim reflection, such as is characteristic of the whole of the symbolical, allegorical way of looking at things which is common to the author of our Epistle with Alexandrine Judaism.

It is this feature of the Epistle which enables us to define its relation to Pauline universalism. That doctrine is not directly

excluded, in fact it is rather presupposed, though it is nowhere explicitly indorsed. But if the Epistle had undertaken to define the place of heathenism in its theory of the world, it must necessarily have placed it in the same negative and preparatory relation to Christianity as Judaism. And if Judaism itself, notwithstanding its close relation to Christianity, is yet but a shadow of the true substance of things, how little could have been said in a positive way of heathenism! This accordingly is another instance of the Jewish Christian character of the Epistle, that it says nothing of heathenism, and tacitly comprehends it in Judaism. On the other hand, however, all the defectiveness and unsubstantiality of Judaism had not prevented it from serving in this transitory order of things to prepare the way for the ideal and essential which should come after it: and why should not this be true of heathenism as well? Thus, in the transcendental view of the world which the Epistle takes, Judaism and heathenism are comprehended in one.

The universal principle of Christianity which breaks through Jewish particularism is also to be recognised in the Christology of the Epistle. Christ, the priest after the order of Melchisedek, is also the Son of God, who is exalted above all, and comprehends all things by his power.¹

¹ Cf. on the Epistle to the Hebrews Köstlin in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 410, *sq.*, 1854, p. 366, *sq.*, 463, *sq.* Köstlin has demonstrated the Alexandrine origin and character of the Epistle with great thoroughness. In one point, however, I cannot agree with him, viz.: that he pronounces the Epistle to be a simple polemic against Jewish Christianity which adhered closely to the ritual law, and says that it has a mediating tendency only in so far as it takes the trouble to give a detailed proof of the transitory nature of the law and of the dissolution of the old covenant from the Old Testament records themselves. Köstlin also declares that he finds in the Epistle no trace of any attempt to bring about an approximation between Jewish Christianity and Paulinism. Now the Epistle cannot be said to be a direct attempt at mediation; its Alexandrinism, however, is neither Judaism nor Paulinism, but stands between the two, and limits both of them, and thus places itself above them. It assumes the character of mediation unconsciously in the same way in which Alexandrinism in general has a tendency to mediation in favour of Judaism. Ritschl continues to maintain that the premisses to the leading idea of the Epistle can be traced to the original apostles (*op. cit.*, 2d ed., p. 169, *sq.*), but in this particular also his view appears to be a very one-sided and contracted one. Compare against it Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theol.* 1858, p. 104, *sq.*

The Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, which stand in the series of the Pauline Epistles, are to be considered from the same point of view; only with this difference, that as the Epistle to the Hebrews represents the standpoint of Jewish Christianity, these Epistles take up their position on the side of Paulinism. They also are striving after a conception of Christianity, in which the difference between Jewish and Gentile Christians shall retire before the concrete vision of a unity standing above the antithesis, and so fade imperceptibly into a vanishing momentum of the common Christian consciousness. Universal reconciliation, reunion of the severed and divided, is the dominant idea which runs through the contents of both the Epistles, and in which everything centres. This idea reaches its highest expression in the Christology of the Epistles. All things in heaven and earth are to be made one in Christ. This is the decree formed by God from eternity, which is fulfilled and realised in Christ at the time appointed for that end (Eph. i. 10). Especially is this the object of his death upon the cross. God purposed to reconcile all things in him and in reference to him, *i.e.* so that everything has its final cause in him, and so in the blood of his cross God has made peace through him for all things that are in earth and in heaven (Col. i. 20). This is brought about in various ways. The two Epistles regard the death of Christ as a contest with a power which is hostile to God. The lofty and all-embracing view which is taken of the person and the work of Christ intensifies the idea of the contest. The death of Christ is the defeat of the hostile principalities and powers: he has disarmed them and led them in triumph, Eph. ii. 2, iii. 10, vi. 12; Col. ii. 15. Thus the *ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου* of whom the apostle spoke in a vague and indefinite way, 1 Cor. ii. 8, have developed into a supersensuous power, and the conflict with and victory over these principalities and powers is an act which affects both the visible and the invisible world.

We have a nearer approach to the Pauline doctrine when we find the removal of the law spoken of as specially belonging to the

atonement work of Christ. God nailed the law, the book of the reckoning against man, to the cross, in order thus to take it away out of the world, Col. ii. 14, and by this men are reconciled to God. The means of the atonement was the fleshly body of Christ, which was slain. In the death of Christ the fleshly body, the seat of sin, was taken off us and borne away. The consequence of this atonement is that we stand before God in the consciousness of freedom from the law, and of the forgiveness of the debt of sin, holy and unblameable, and not subject to condemnation, Col. i. 20, *sq.*, ii. 11. One special feature of the universal process of reconciliation which is accomplished in the death of Christ is the union of Jews and Gentiles in one and the same religious communion. This indeed must be regarded as the practical end which these Epistles have in view. The death of Christ is an arrangement made by God for the purpose of removing the wall of partition between Gentiles and Jews, of making peace between them, and thereby reconciling them both together to God. The absolute privilege of Judaism is taken away from it by the removal of the Mosaic law. In this way all national distinctions and divisions are removed, as well as every other cause of separation which arises out of the different relations of life; and in Christianity a new man appears, who is not indeed quite disengaged as yet from the old man, but has to put off the old man more and more by practical conduct, Col. iii. 9; Eph. ii. 10, 15, iv. 22. The two parties, Gentiles and Jews, being thus united in one body, are reconciled with God, and have access to the Father in the same Spirit, Eph. ii. 16-18. As the distinction between Gentiles and Jews disappears in the unity of the new man, so Christianity stands above Paganism and Judaism as the absolute religion, according to the description of the absolute superiority of Christianity in the Epistle to the Ephesians, iii. 5, *sq.*, as the mystery preordained before the beginning of the world, which extends infinitely beyond all other things, which was hid in God from eternity, which had never before been made known to men, but had at last been declared by Christ and revealed through the Spirit to his apostles and prophets.

If Christianity is the absolute religion, then Paganism and Judaism must stand in the same negative relation towards it. Yet we hear of a certain identification of Judaism with Christianity. The Epistle to the Colossians, like the Epistle to the Hebrews, regards the Old Testament as a shadow of something else, ii. 17. If the ordinances of the Old Testament religion are but a shadow of things to come, while the reality is to be found in Christianity alone (*το σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*), it is only a small measure of truth and reality that is conceded to the Old Testament religion. Yet the relation of type and antitype being there, that religion, weak and imperfect as it is, has so much connection with Christianity as the type must have. And in this sense the Epistle to the Colossians seeks to demonstrate analogies between Judaism and Christianity. Judaism has lost, it is true, that absolute claim which it used to put forward in its commandment of circumcision, but Christianity has a circumcision of its own to replace that one, not a fleshly one indeed, or made with men's hands, but a spiritual one, consisting in the putting off of the fleshly body; the circumcision of Christ which takes place in baptism, and in which Christ quickens those who are dead in uncircumcision of the flesh, by this, that they renounce all sensual lusts and desires, and are dedicated to a morally holy life, ii. 11, *sq.* This statement at once involves that Judaism and Christianity are drawn near each other, and regarded as essentially one. This is done still more unmistakably in Eph. ii. 11, *sq.* Here it is said of the Gentiles that they being called uncircumcised by the so-called circumcision in the flesh, had been during the whole period of paganism without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers to the covenants of promise, without hope and without God in the world; but that now they who sometime were afar off have been brought near in the blood of Christ. But all that is said here is that the Gentiles have received a share in that which the Jews had possessed before, and thus Christianity is not the absolute religion in which Judaism and Paganism are alike absorbed, but Judaism itself is the substantial contents of Christianity, and there is only

this change, that through the death of Christ Judaism has been extended to the Gentiles in the universalism of Christianity. From this point of view the Gentiles hold no higher position than that of having come in afterwards and been admitted to participation; but on the other hand it is stated with the greatest emphasis that they have now been introduced to the full enjoyment of the same rights of citizenship; they are no longer strangers and aliens, but fellow-citizens of the saints and of the household of God. The author of the Epistle to the Ephesians can find no words strong enough to set forth this equalising of the Gentiles with the Jews; he says of the *ἔθνη* that they are *συγκληρόνομα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, ii. 19, iii. 6. Thus, though it cannot be denied that the Jewish Christians had the priority of possession, yet they have no longer any advantage over the Gentile Christians: the relation of the two parties to each other is a very different one from that laid down by the author of the Apocalypse, who is unwilling to regard the Gentiles as excluded from the Messianic community, but is unable to conceive of their admission on any other footing than that of being brought under the legal title of the old twelve tribes of Israel. Only in this way could they in his view be taken up into the number of the qualified members of the Church of God: Rev. vii. 4.

The fundamental conception of the two Epistles is the body of Christ, in which the two parts are to become one body (Eph. ii. 16); the *σῶμα Χριστοῦ*, as the Christian Church in which Jews and Gentiles are united in one and the same community. Feeling as they do the power of the antitheses which hold Jews and Gentiles asunder, and the necessity of removing them, if there is to be a Christian Church at all, the writers insist with the greatest earnestness and emphasis on the unity of the Church. Unity is the very nature and essence of the Church; this unity is provided by Christianity with all the momenta which belong to it; there is one body, one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, etc. (Eph. iv. 4). This unity was founded by the death of Christ: in him the enmity, the wall of partition, everything positive by which the two were

divided, is put an end to (Eph. ii. 14, *sq.*). Starting from this point the writer rises higher, to where the ground of all unity is to be found. The power of the death of Christ to unite and to found a universal communion can only be understood when it is considered that Christ is the central point of the whole universe, sustaining all and holding all together. The Christian consciousness, as it contemplates the Church in the process of self-constitution, and is filled, in this contemplation, with the absolute contents of Christianity, feels more and more the impulse to regard this absolute as an existence above the world and time. The Christology of the two Epistles is therefore intimately connected with that need which arises out of the circumstances of the immediate present, of union in the idea of the one Church which absorbs into itself all distinctions and antitheses. When we place ourselves within the mode of view of these Epistles, we find that the consciousness to which they give utterance is a genuinely catholic one. Comparing them on the one side with the Epistle to the Hebrews, and on the other with the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, we have three different interpretations of Christianity, in all of which the same impulse towards unity is seeking to find its highest expression and its dogmatic starting-point. In the Epistle to the Hebrews Christ is the high priest, in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies the prophet of the truth, and in the Ephesian and Colossian Epistles the central being of the whole universe; but in each of these forms the Christian consciousness beholds the principle of the same unity, the idea of which was to be realised in the antitheses of the different contending parties.

Another point in which the catholicising tendency of the two Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians is distinctly to be recognised is, that in them works, the practical realisation of the moral, take up a very independent position over against faith. It is true that the Epistle to the Philippians, which belongs to the same category with the two of which we have been speaking, appears to lay great and studied emphasis on the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith as opposed to justification by the law (iii. 9),

but this is done in a purely external way. We fail to see that profound interest at work which Paul had, to establish it as a general truth that faith and not works was the principle of justification. In the Ephesian and Colossian Epistles we only hear of forgiveness of sins, redemption, atonement: it is ascribed to faith that we are saved by grace (Eph. ii. 8); but along with faith great stress is laid upon works, which are even included in God's foreordination (Eph. ii. 10). In the transcendent Christology of these Epistles everything that bears upon the salvation of man lies beyond the sphere of temporal existence, and is connected with the eternal decree of God which is realised in time. And in this view man's salvation and all that belongs to it can only be regarded as a free gift of the grace of God. Grace is the principle which creates man anew by faith in Christ. For man must become something new by Christianity: the old man is to be put off, and the new man put on, who, as compared with the former, is another man (Col. iii. 9; Eph. iv. 21, *sq.*). Yet there is but renewed in man the image according to which he was originally created by God. As the apostle Paul sets most value upon faith as the principle which brings about union with Christ, these Epistles fix their attention chiefly on that moral perfection of man which proceeds from faith, and the history of which process moves through the same antithesis of death and life which is represented in Christ (Col. iii. 1, *sq.*).¹

The numerous echoes of Gnosticism and its peculiar doctrines which are to be found in the three Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians are sufficient, had we no other ground to go upon, to fix the position of these works in the post-apostolic age. Still more directly and indubitably do the Pastoral Epistles carry us to the period of the Gnostic heresy. These Epistles occupy, like the others, a well-marked place in the series of the efforts after unity which proceeded from the Pauline side. They belong to a period in the history of the development of the nascent Church, when danger had begun to threaten from the heretics, and

¹ Cf. my Paul, T. T. F. L. ii. 1-44: Schwegler das nachap. Zeitalter, ii. 325, *sq.*

it was felt necessary to resist them. This could not but make it appear very desirable to confirm the unity of the Church, to draw the different members of the ecclesiastical community closer together, and to obtain an organisation which should extend to all the relations of the Church's life. The tendency of these Epistles is the same as that of the pseudo-Ignatian Epistles and of the pseudo-Clementine writings. Now the efforts which were made to give the Church a firm constitution resting on definite principles, appear to have proceeded originally from the Jewish Christian party, and thus the Pastoral Epistles are evidence of the readiness with which these advances were taken up on the Pauline side, and of the willingness of Paulinists to co-operate for the end proposed. They place in the mouth of their apostle Paul a series of pastoral instructions which he cannot possibly have thought of, but the inculcation of which was now in the interest of Paulinism as well as of Jewish Christianity.¹

The equally pseudonymous Epistles, that of James and the first of Peter, are to be placed somewhat earlier than the Pastoral Epistles. Our discussion of them must be confined to the question how the two members of the antithesis which is now being adjusted are here related to each other, and in what direction we can recognise in them a more definite formation of Catholic Christianity.

It is impossible to deny that the Epistle of James presupposes the Pauline doctrine of justification. And if this be so, its tendency is distinctly anti-Pauline, though it may not be aimed directly against the apostle himself. The Epistle contends against a one-sided conception of the Pauline doctrine, which was dangerous to practical Christianity. The expressions in which this is done go straight to the principle; against the Pauline formula of justification there is set up another formula, according to which, in the relation of faith and works, works are as distinctly the real and substantial element as faith is with Paul.² On the other side,

¹ Cf. my work: *Die sogen. Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus*, 1835.

² The chief point of the difference lies in the notion of *πίστις*. In contrast to the ideality of the Pauline faith the author of the Epistle of James occupies the

however, the author is not unacquainted with the Pauline idea of making the law an inward thing. Not only does he speak of the commandment of love as a royal law; he also speaks of a law of liberty. The law can only have become such a law of liberty for him by his standing over against the outwardness of the law and knowing himself inwardly free from it, as the apostle Paul was from his standpoint. The same endeavour after inwardness is to be seen in the fact that he places the principle of salvation, not indeed in faith, as Paul does, but in the word of truth as a principle of regeneration immanent in man. For the *λόγος ἀληθείας* can only be a *λόγος ἔμφυτος*, a living impulse of fruitful activity implanted in man, on the supposition that there is an inner consciousness of truth which answers to the outward revelation. The Epistle proceeded from the endeavour to counteract an impractical tendency which was declining into doctrinal formalism, and to produce such an impression upon the Christian consciousness, now settling into the form it was to wear, as was in the interest of Jewish Christianity. Accordingly the author of the Epistle, who has to represent Jewish Christianity, is the highest authority on the Jewish Christian side. James, known to us in other ways, writes to the twelve tribes in the dispersion, *i.e.* to the Jewish Christians who lived among Gentile Christians, and thus figures here as elsewhere, as the head of the mother-church at Jerusalem. The author by no means intends his Epistle to be a mere polemic against the Pauline doctrine of justification; he places before himself the general task of giving, from the standpoint of his more liberal and spiritualised Jewish Christianity, a comprehensive view of the whole field of the Christian life as it manifests itself in its essentially practical nature, in suffering and in action. He aims at delineating the Christian as he ought to be, as a perfect man in the perfection of

standpoint of genuine Jewish realism, and considers a faith without works to be as good as nothing, a dead and lifeless thing (ii. 17, 26), which, in fact, has not arrived at existence at all, since in its pure ideality it can give no empirical proof of its reality (ii. 18). Faith, even when existing in itself, only comes to its full reality in works. In any case, it does no more than co-operate with *δικαιοῦσθαι ἐξ ἔργων* (ii. 22).

the Christian life, which can only be properly conceived as a perfect work. This shows us how well the writer was aware of his position in the age, and of the significance of his Jewish Christian standpoint. His contention was perfectly justified from his side, and yet was free from any personal polemic, and in the doctrine of works and of the practical behaviour of the Christian which he thus upheld, he made a by no means unimportant contribution to the formation of catholic Christianity which was now going on. Whatever is opposed to one-sided tendencies, and seeks to adjust one thing with another, and to place the contraries in their proper position of equilibrium, is essentially and at once in the spirit of catholic Christianity; and it would be doing an injustice to the Epistle in this respect to ascribe to it a harsh anti-Pauline tendency.

The characteristics of the Epistle of James, then, are, that it expressly takes up a Jewish Christian standpoint, and that the author writes to the Christian Churches of the Diaspora, while on the other hand the Epistle bears unmistakable traces of the influence of Paulinism, and of the need that was felt to come to an understanding with it. In other ways also the Epistle betrays the circumstances of a later age. All this applies to another Epistle also which is closely allied with that of James, the First of Peter. A comparison of the supposed doctrine of Peter with that of Paul shows a very striking affinity between the two. This is not denied by such scholars as believe both in the authenticity of the Epistle and in the existence of a peculiar and independent Petrine doctrine, and the only explanation they can give is, that the apostle Paul read and used the Epistle of Peter. But those who are convinced that the Epistle carries them to the time of Trajan's measures against the Christians, and to a time when the legend of the apostle Peter's residence at Rome had already become current, have an equal right to adopt the opposite interpretation. They will see in the parallels of this Epistle with that to the Romans and that to the Ephesians an accommodation to Pauline ideas, which proves, if nothing more, how strong an inclination

there was upon the Jewish Christian side to look favourably upon a system which adopted such ideas as the Pauline doctrine of the death of Christ, 1 Pet. iv. 1, and turned them to the uses of practical Christianity. The aim and tendency of the Epistle are clearly disclosed by the author himself when at the close (v. 12), he names Silvanus, the well-known companion of the apostle Paul, as the bearer of his Epistle, calls him a faithful brother, and says that the object of his writing is to give his readers a confirmatory testimony of the truth of their Christian faith, and to show that whether they be Jewish or Gentile Christians, if they only are agreed and stand fast in what he has expounded to them as the true contents of the Christian faith, they are to be regarded as orthodox Christians. In the Petrine Epistle also the practical interest predominates, and the circumstances of the time are seen to be establishing the conviction that the essence of Christianity consisted above all in the righteousness of a good conversation; so that the differences of the first age of the Church are more and more left out of sight.¹

In spite, however, of all these advances on one side and the other to an approximation and a compromise, there was still, as the close of the Petrine Epistle reminds us, one great obstacle which it was necessary to remove if the work of unification was not to fall to pieces again for the want of a sufficiently secured foundation.

How could Jewish and Gentile Christians draw closer to each other and join in one and the same religious and ecclesiastical community, how could the Christian Church which arose out of

¹ Cf. on the Epistle of James, the time to which it is to be assigned, and its contents and character, my Paul, ii. 297; and on the First Epistle of Peter, my Dissertation in the Theol. Jahrb. 1856, p. 193, *sq.*, where I have stated at length my opinion on Weiss's work on the Petrine doctrine: Berlin, 1855. It is difficult to understand how any one can continue to defend the alleged apostolic authorship of writings which bear the marks of pseudonymity so plainly on their face, by such random and loose assertions as are to be found only too often in the pages of Ritschl and Weiss. One would say that an apologetic like this was bent on blocking up the way to a sound and living conception of the history of the earliest age of the Christian Church. It is not worth while to discuss vague hypotheses which have no support in history and no coherence in themselves. Cf. Hilgenfeld, *op. cit.* p. 405, *sq.*

their union regard itself as a Church built on the foundation of the apostles, if it could not get rid of the consciousness that the two apostles who had stood at the head of the two great parties had held such antagonistic views and principles, and if it was impossible to think of these apostles without remembering the conflict which had arisen between them, and which had never been reconciled? It is evident that any agreement which Jewish and Gentile Christians might desire to form could only be regarded as well founded, if the relation now actually subsisting between them could be regarded as one which the two apostles had themselves contemplated, and could be traced to their mutual agreement. This is the point where the Acts of the Apostles not only finds its place as a literary product, but also plays its part as an independent factor of the history in the development of these relations. It has been shown incontrovertibly by recent investigations,¹ that the Acts is not to be regarded as a purely historical work, but only as a presentation of the history following a certain definite tendency. The true aim of the work, then, must have been to carry back the solution of the questions which were then the object of universal interest to the point of the discussion of the apostle Paul's position relatively to the older apostles. If Paulinism appears in this work in a form greatly modified from the original,—and looking at the work from the point of view we have indicated we cannot but judge this to be the case,—it yet very decidedly asserts its Pauline character in two particulars. It holds fast as the essence, the principle of Paulinism, the universal scope of Christianity, the right of a Gentile Christianity, free from the law, by the side of Jewish Christianity. It carries this universalism through all the stages of the history which it deals with, beginning with the words which it puts in the mouth of the Lord before his ascension (i. 8), when the disciples ask him about the restoration of the kingdom of Israel, and he answers them by directing them to preach the Gospel in Jerusalem and in the whole of Judæa and

¹ Cf. Schneckenburger, *über den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte*, 1841. My Paul, i. p. 4, *sq.*, and Zeller, *Acts*, vol. ii. p. 139, *sq.*, 173, *sq.*

Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth, and ending with the declaration which closes the missionary activity of the apostle Paul when he says to the Jews that the message of salvation is sent to the Gentiles, and that they will hear it (xxviii. 18). As decidedly does it insist on the conditions without recognising which it was impossible for Christianity to fulfil its universal mission. It leaves it open to the Jewish Christians to be subject to the law as much as before, but it absolves the Gentile Christians from the law, and merely imposes upon them the obligation to abstain from those habits which were most offensive to the Jewish Christians, and stood most in the way of a brotherly union, xv. 28, *sq.*

We must take up our position at this central point of the Acts, its Paulinism, in order to appreciate aright the aim and character of the work. In the two points we have mentioned it compromises nothing of the Pauline principles. In everything relating to the person of the apostle Paul, however, it is lax and full of concessions. If we compare the account which the Acts gives us of his character and conduct with the picture which he gives us of himself in his own writings, we find a very remarkable contrast between the Paul of the Acts and the Paul of the Pauline writings. According to the Acts he made concessions to the Jewish Christians which, according to his own clear and distinct enunciation of his principles, it is impossible that he should have made. On the other side we find the same phenomenon. The Acts presents Peter to us in a light in which we can no longer recognise him as one of the chief representatives of the Jewish Christianity of Jerusalem. We are thus obliged to think that the immediate object for which the Acts was written was to draw a parallel between the two apostles, in which Peter should appear in a Pauline, and Paul in a Petrine character. Even in respect of the deeds and the fortunes of the two men we find a remarkable agreement. There is no kind of miracle ascribed to Peter in the first part of the work which does not find its counterpart in the second. It is even more striking to observe how in the doctrine of their discourses, and in their mode of action as apostles, they

not only agree with each other, but appear to have actually changed parts. In the discourses of the apostle Paul we find him setting forth monotheism as against pagan polytheism, preaching the resurrection and the Messiahship of Jesus, and exhorting to repentance and good works; while only in one place, and there but faintly, do we hear a word of the peculiar Pauline doctrine of the law and of justification, xiii. 38, *sq.* The older apostles, on the other hand, Peter and even James, deliver themselves in a much more Pauline spirit. There is no difference before God, says Peter, xv. 9, between Jew and Gentile, for even the Gentiles, the unclean, are purified by faith: he calls the law, xv. 10, a yoke which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear; he declares that Jews as well as Gentiles can only be saved through the grace of Christ, and that in fact God accepts in every nation, without respect of persons, every one that fears him and works righteousness, xv. 11, x. 34. Even James makes a confession of Pauline universalism, xv. 17. It is the same with the rest of the conduct of these two apostles. Before Paul appears at all, Peter is made to baptize the first Gentile, Cornelius, with the consent of the Church at Jerusalem, while Paul performs the rite of circumcision on Timothy, the Gentile Christian, out of regard for his Jewish fellow-countrymen, and in general conducts himself as an Israelite pious in the law. Even amidst the most pressing business of his apostolic office, he does not neglect to make the customary journey to Jerusalem: he undertakes a vow and becomes a Nazarite, with the express object of refuting the calumny that he taught people to abandon the law; he has so high a respect for the theocratic privileges of his people, that from first to last he always preaches first to the Jews, and only turns to the Gentiles when compelled by their unbelief, and constrained by divine commands to do so. The two apostles are even made parallel with each other in respect to their call: Peter as well as Paul has a vision in which he is charged with the apostolate to the Gentiles.

The only possible explanation of all this is, that the facts of the case were deliberately altered in accordance with a certain tendency.

This, however, cannot have been done for a merely apologetic object, referring only to the person of the apostle Paul. We cannot doubt that the tendency of the Acts is conciliatory or irenic. The work aims not merely at a personal vindication of the apostle Paul from the charges and prejudices of the Judaists, but also at opening up a way for them to be reconciled with Pauline Christianity. With this end not only were Paul and his cause to be recommended to Jewish Christians, but such a conception of Christianity and such a representation of the character and of the doctrine of Paul were to be made current upon the Pauline side, as should remove or at least conceal the most offensive aspects of Paulinism, and render it more fit for that union with Jewish Christianity to which the author aspired. The Acts is thus the attempt at conciliation, the overture of peace, of a member of the Pauline party, who desired to purchase the recognition of Gentile Christianity on the part of the Jewish Christians by concessions made to Judaism by his side, and sought to influence both parties in this direction. It thus gives us a very clear idea of the efforts made at that time with a view to a catholic Christianity. But for all his deliberate and systematic arrangements for this end, the author could not fail to be aware what the real point was on which the attainment of his object ultimately depended. A union of the two parties could only be attained practically in so far as their knowledge of the persons of the two apostles enabled them to feel that the union was possible. This is the real point of the delineation of the Acts, pervaded as the whole work is by its tendency. In this respect it deserves to be specially noticed how carefully it refrains even from touching the irritating element which was present in the history of its apostle. How striking it is to find that it passes over the conflict at Antioch, of which the Clementines had so lively a remembrance, in complete silence; that it does not even mention Titus, the companion of the apostle, who, according to Gal. ii. 1, caused such great offence to the Christians of Jerusalem; and that, instead of these two scenes, it mentions the strife with Barnabas, as if this much less important incident had been all that was wrong at that time! It looks as if

the writer felt it necessary to make up in some way for his silence about the refusal to circumcise Titus, when, in place of that incident, he gives the circumcision of Timothy, with regard to which the apostle was so ready and willing to meet the wishes of the Jews. In these particulars is there not a distinct attempt to throw a veil over the past in order to bury it for the future in the night of oblivion? And how careful the Acts is, on the other side, to bring the apostle in contact with the older apostles on every opportunity; thus suggesting, of course, that a truly brotherly relation had subsisted between him and them. What the Acts desired people to believe did actually come to be believed, and the belief never afterwards wavered. This proves how well the author of the Acts understood the age he lived in, and how accurate an estimate he formed of what it was necessary for the general good of the Church to keep a hold of.¹

¹ The considerations which made the author of the Acts think it essential in his labours with a view to unity to go back to the personal history of the apostles, were also at work in the production of a number of those Epistles which bear apostolic names, but which we are obliged to pronounce pseudonymous. Nothing could pass into the general consciousness that did not rest on apostolic authority; and thus it was necessary, even with what was addressed to the special circumstances of the later age, to go back to an apostolic name, or even to place it in the mouth of the apostle to whose party the writer belonged, in the shape of an Epistle which he was said to have written. Thus, when we have satisfied ourselves that many of the writings of that age are tendency-writings, their pseudonymous character becomes perfectly natural. Pseudonymity, *i.e.* the use of a name long familiar to the public and representing a particular tendency, is the means by which a writer obtains the ear of his age with a view to exerting an influence upon others. In an age which moved in such strong antitheses, we are not surprised to find such a number of tendency-writings. It is important to bear this in mind in seeking to arrive at a correct appreciation of the extensive pseudonymous literature which is a characteristic feature of that age; and we shall thus escape from the mistake, possible indeed only to men of prejudiced minds and with a limited knowledge of antiquity, that pseudonymity and literary deception are equivalent terms. On this question cf. Schweigler, *Nachap. Zeitalter* i. p. 79, *sq.*; my *Paul*, ii. 110; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1844, p. 548; Ritschl, *Entstehg. d. alt-kath. Kirche*, 1st ed., p. 195, *sq.* The most comprehensive and thorough discussion of the question is that by Kostlin in his *Dissertation on the pseudonymous literature of the primitive Church*, a contribution to the history of the formation of the canon: *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1851, p. 149, *sq.* No other New Testament book allows of so convincing a demonstration of the tendency under which it was written, as the Acts of the Apostles.

The works of the apostolic Fathers form a group by themselves after the canonical writings. The idea that these writings are separated from the whole body of the canonical books by as wide a gulf as that which divides from each other two wholly different periods of Church history, is only possible to those who hold the most extravagant view of the inspiration of the whole canonical collection. Several of the canonical works belong to the post-apostolic age, and at a first view the only thing to indicate to us that we are passing from one class of writings to another, is that the pseudonymous titles are not from the circle of the apostles, but from that of their disciples. The latest investigations¹ have placed it finally beyond question that pseudonymity prevails here as well as in the canon, and that the names of Barnabas, Clement, Ignatius, do not indicate the real origin, but only the character and tendency of these works. Here again, then, the chief question comes to be as to the relation in which the two factors of the historical movement, Paulinism and Jewish Christianity, stand to each other in these writings, and in how far we can trace in the growth of that relation the development of these two factors into catholic Christianity. In this respect also the line of division between these writings and the canonical ones is not clearly marked, but fluctuating; yet the former certainly take up their position on the one side of the antithesis or on the other in a more decided manner than the character of canonical writings permitted. Yet this does not dispose of the question as to their position, nor prevent it from being still a matter of controversy. Thus Schwegeler has taken up a view of them which brings out chiefly the Ebionitic element which they contain, and allows Pauline elements only in so far as they may be credited with the object of a capitulation between the two parties. Ritschl, on the other hand, has been carried so far by his disagreement with Schwegeler's conception of the post-apostolic age, as to reckon even the Shepherd of Hermas and Justin Martyr as adherents of the Pauline tendency.

¹ Cf. Hilgenfeld, *die apostolischen väter, Untersuchungen über Inhalt und Ursprung der unter ihrem Namen erhaltenen Schriften*: Halle, 1853.

The Epistle of Barnabas and the pseudo-Ignatian Epistles stand most distinctly upon the Jewish Christian side. The Epistle of Barnabas holds the typical allegorical view of the relation of Judaism to Christianity which we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews, with the distinction that it looks at that relation not in the objective but entirely in the subjective aspect. The two are related to each other as type and substance, but the important point is to have the consciousness of this relation. Christianity is not so much Judaism completed and come to its full reality, as Judaism unveiled and made manifest. That which lay concealed in Judaism under types and allegories, but from the beginning had reference solely to Christianity, is now disclosed to the consciousness, and known in its true significance as that which it really is. Christianity then is essentially this knowledge: it is a Gnosis in that sense of the word in which it denotes a knowledge arrived at through allegorical interpretation. From the objective point of view of the Epistle to the Hebrews the idea which is realised in Christianity is at least discernible in Judaism as in a shadowy reflection: according to the subjective view of the Epistle of Barnabas Judaism and Christianity are related to each other simply as not knowing and knowing. Moses spoke so entirely in the spirit, and the meaning of his ceremonial law is so entirely allegorical, that the law virtually did not exist for the Jews at all, since they were ignorant of this sense, and so entirely misunderstood it. Moses, it is true, gave the covenant to the Fathers, but by reason of their sins they were not worthy to receive it, and Moses accordingly broke the tables of the law. We are now the heirs of the Jews, and as such we have received the covenant of Jesus; for Jesus was appointed to deliver us from darkness, and to institute us into the covenant by his word (cap. 14). Circumcision cannot have been meant to have that carnal significance which the Jews attribute to it, for it is practised by other nations as well, by the Syrians, the Arabians, the Egyptians, and by all the priests of the idols. It was only with a spiritual reference to Jesus that Abraham introduced circumcision (cap. 9). All this at once falls away as

soon as it is understood in its true meaning, and so Christianity is a new law, which imposes no yoke of compulsion, but asks man to present himself as a sacrifice to God (cap. 2). In fact the writer comes so near the Gnostic degradation of Judaism as to explain the failure of the exhortations of the prophets to raise the Jews out of their carnal mind to more spiritual conceptions, by saying that the people was bewitched by an evil angel (cap. 9). Here then we find an utterance of the feeling that there was something new in Christianity, something that Christianity had revealed for the first time; and this is spoken of in a way which, to say the least, strongly reminds us of Paulinism.¹

In this antagonism to Judaism the pseudo-Ignatian Epistles stand next that of Barnabas. The author of these Epistles expressly acknowledges the apostle Paul as his model, and applies this name to Christianity itself in contrasting its newness and autonomy with Judaism. As disciples of Christ, the author of these Epistles reminds his readers, they must live according to Christianity (*κατὰ Χριστιανισμόν*); he who is called with another name than this, does not belong to God. It is a contradiction to call Jesus the Christ, and yet to adhere to Judaism, for Christianity did not believe in Judaism, but Judaism in Christianity. What truth there was in Judaism belonged not to Judaism but to Christianity: the prophets of the Old Testament and the Jews before Christ

¹ The Epistle is founded upon the basis of Paulinism, but its true character is Alexandrine, as is that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Cf. Hilgenfeld, *die apost. väter*, p. 37, *sq.*; and *Zeitschr., für wissensch. Theol.*, 1858, p. 569, *sq.* In the first edition of the *Entstehung d. alt-kath. Kirche*, p. 276, Ritschl characterised the standpoint of the Epistle as an evolution of the Pauline principle; but in his second edition, p. 570, he no longer recognises the Pauline standpoint of the author, but holds that his view bears all the marks of Gentile Christianity at the time when it was becoming catholic. Against this view Hilgenfeld justly observes (*Zeitschr.* p. 570) that what is said of the original apostles is enough to demonstrate the pure Paulinism of the author. Who but a Paulinist could have not merely placed the twelve apostles in the closest connection with the twelve tribes of the Jews, but also represented them in the most unfavourable light as having been beyond conception sinful (cap. v.)? As for the date of the Epistle, I see nothing in the remarks which Hilgenfeld has made upon the other side, to induce me to change the view I have expressed in my *Lehrbuch der Dogmengesch.*, 2d. ed., p. 80.

who hoped for his coming were even then not Jews but Christians. So decided is the author of these Epistles in his anti-Jewish spirit, and so anxious is he to remove everything Jewish from the Christian society, and to create a fixed outward distinction between the two, that he can allow no name to be applied to the Church but *Χριστιανοί, Χριστιανισμός*.¹ In spite, however, of this complete breach with everything Jewish, he was working towards the foundation of a catholic Church under forms which involved that the Gentile Christians should attach themselves to the Jewish Christians. We shall have to return to this feature of the Epistles at a later part of this work.

In the first Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians and in the Epistle of Polycarp there are clear indications of Paulinism. It is remarkable how Clement not only names the two apostles, Peter and Paul, together, but even represents the fame of the latter as outshining that of the former (cap. 5). And in the Epistle of Polycarp there is an eulogium upon Paul which would leave no doubt as to the Pauline character of those writings, even had we nothing else to judge by. He is called the blessed and glorious Paul, whose wisdom no other can equal, who by his own presence founded the Philippians accurately and firmly in the word of truth, and in his absence also wrote Epistles to them, which can build up those who read them in the faith which is the mother of all. It cannot, however, be denied that faith as the means of justification in the Pauline sense is very evenly balanced by an emphatic exhortation to good works and to love. The two tendencies resolve themselves into a neutral form of Christianity in which faith and works stand side by side without any attempt to bring them together.² The Ignatian Epistles go so far as to place love above faith. The first Epistle of Clement does not forget to insist upon the other side; it asserts that we are not justified by ourselves, nor by our wisdom, intelligence or piety, or by works

¹ Cf. my Dissertation über den Ursprung des Episcopate, p. 179, *sq.*; Schwegler, Nachaport. Zeit. ii. 163, *sq.*

² Cf. Köstlin, *op. cit.* p. 247, *sq.* The characteristics of the Epistle which Köstlin dwells on most are the interest it shows for the law and for the Old Testament revelation.

which we have accomplished in holiness of heart; but it has equally emphatic exhortations not to be weary in well-doing, nor to let love be wanting, but to work out every good work with zeal and cheerfulness, and to follow the divine will in the work of righteousness. The Epistle of Polycarp places edification in faith, which as the mother of all is preceded by love and followed by hope.¹

The Shepherd of Hermas, which belongs to the same class of writings, is unquestionably a product and a monument of Jewish Christianity. The strict monotheistic Judaism of this work appears in the proposition which it puts prominently forward as being the fundamental article of the commands communicated to Hermas by the Shepherd, and as the whole substance of faith, namely, that there is one God who has created all things. The requirement which naturally follows from this is to follow the will of God. Attention has been drawn to the facts that the Shepherd of Hermas does not declare the law of Christ to be identical with Mosaic law, and that it contains no reference to the specific Jewish Christian duties, neither to circumcision for the Jews nor to the laws of the proselytes for Christians of Gentile birth; and it has been argued that a work marked by such omissions must have proceeded from a circle of Chris-

¹ Cf. Schweigler, *op. cit.*, p. 129, 157, 168. As against Ritschl and Lipsius (*de Clementis Romani Ep. ad. Cor. priore disquisitio*, Lips., 1855), Hilgenfeld, *loc. cit.* p. 572, *sq.*, considers Clemens Romanus to be a thorough Paulinist, only he says it cannot be overlooked that this Paulinism is an advance towards a milder and more conciliatory attitude towards Jewish Christianity than we find in the Epistle of Barnabas. In following the inner development of Paulinism we here come to a more conciliatory spirit, and find a view of the apostolic decree prevailing which was entirely unknown to the apostolic age. There is also satisfactory proof of the existence of a similar conciliatory disposition on the part of the Jewish Christians of Rome, in the Gospel of Mark, also Roman, and belonging to the same period. On internal grounds Hilgenfeld thinks there is every probability that in Christian Rome, which even at that period was able to assert a certain degree of independence of the Jewish Christian mother-Church at Jerusalem, and was predestined to be the new centre of the catholic Church, the two original opposing elements of Christianity first came into a certain equilibrium with each other. I agree with this view. We see from the Epistle of Barnabas that the Epistle of Clemens Romanus cannot be placed at a very early period (*cf.* p. 139). The exact determination of its date depends on the result yet to be arrived at from the investigations set on foot by Hitzig and Volkmar on the book of Judith, as the earliest citation of that work occurs in the Epistle of Clement.

tianity which occupied an independent position with regard to Judaism, *i.e.* from the Pauline circle.¹ But all that these facts prove is that Jewish Christianity had by this time advanced to a much more liberal spirit. The fundamental idea of the work is, as in the Apocalypse, the number of the twelve tribes. To the twelve peoples of the Church of God the believing Gentiles have been added, so as to make good the gaps which had been produced by the unbelief of the Jews. The people of God who before the earthly appearance of Christ stood under his immediate superintendence and guidance was the Jewish people, and so when Christ blots out the sins of the people and gives it a new law which leads to life, it is the Jewish people that is meant, the old people of God, not a new people from among the Gentiles. So the number of the twelve tribes corresponds to the number of the twelve apostles; yet while this number is retained as it is in the Apocalypse, Paul is not included in it, but stands, as in that work, among the subordinate teachers and preachers of the Son of God. The author's mode of view is strongly marked with the stamp of legalism. Everything depends on the observance of the divine commandments and the meritoriousness of works. Faith itself stands at the head of the commandments. In two points the Shepherd cannot deny the universalism of Christianity. The law communicated by Christ is with him the preaching of the Son of God to the ends of the earth; and the righteous men of the Old Testament do not enter into the kingdom of God until they have been baptized by the apostles and evangelists in the under world.²

These writings contain in greater or less degree the elements out of which catholic Christianity arose. Of the period of transition we have no more faithful representative than Justin Martyr. He stands equally near to the apostolic Fathers, on the one hand, and to the catholic doctors of the Church, on the other. Like the author of the Epistle of Barnabas, he sees in Christianity a new

¹ Ritschl, *op. cit.*, 1st ed., p. 297, *sq.*; 2d ed., p. 288, *sq.*

² For evidence to support these statements see Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl., Theologie*, p. 423, *sq.*; and *die apost. väter*, p. 161, *sq.*

law; and he further agrees with that writer in the reason he assigns for this, that the Jews misunderstood the ceremonial laws and religious institutions which constitute the true essence of Judaism, by interpreting them in a carnal way, so that the true understanding of them has only been reached in Christianity.¹ Circumcision had not that carnal significance which the Jews assigned to it. The true meaning of it is to be found in that spiritual circumcision in which the foreskin of the heart is taken away. Even the patriarchs had this spiritual circumcision, and Christians now receive it in baptism, in which as sinners they receive forgiveness of sins through the mercy of God.² And everything of this kind, such as the Sabbaths and festivals, the prohibitions with regard to food, the sacrifices, and the temple-worship, had only a spiritual meaning, which had reference to Christianity. The intention of all these institutions was merely transitory, they were given merely on account of the hardness of the people's hearts, and were simply to serve to keep the thought of God, in this external way at least, close to the people's minds. That they had no inner religious value of their own is clearly apparent from the fact that at the time of the patriarchs they did not exist: the patriarchs obtained the favour of God without them, as for instance Abraham, as every one is aware, obtained from God the testimony that he was righteous, not on account of his circumcision, but on account of his faith. And since God is always the same, and was no other at the time of Moses than at the time of Enoch, the scope of all these institutions of the Jewish religion must have been limited to a particular period.³

¹ Dial. cum Jud. Tryph. c. 14.

² *Op. cit.* chap. 43.

³ Justin distinguishes three elements in the Old Testament—a moral, a typical, and a directly positive element. No one, he says (Dial. cap. 44), can receive anything of the blessings bestowed through Christ, except those who in their disposition are like the faith of Abraham, and know all mysteries, λέγω δὲ ὅτι τὶς μὲν ἐντολὴ εἰς θεοσέβειαν καὶ δικαιοπραξίαν διετέτακτο, τὶς δὲ ἐντολὴ καὶ πράξις ὁμοίως εἴρητο, ἢ εἰς μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ διὰ τὸ σκληροκάριον τοῦ λαοῦ ὑμῶν. The moral contents of the Old Testament Justin calls τὰ φύσει καλὰ καὶ εὐσεβῆ καὶ δίκαια, or τὰ καθόλου καὶ φύσει καὶ αἰώνια καλὰ, cap. 45: this is the chief substance of the religion of the patriarchs, and from this the πρὸς σκληροκαρδίαν τοῦ λαοῦ διαταχθέντα are distinguished, as the purely positive element.

Of circumcision Justin has but a low estimate: he declares it to be the sign by which the Jews were to be made recognisable among all other nations, as those who deserved to suffer all that was inflicted on them at the hands of others. What we see in this instance is characteristic of Justin. To his way of thinking, things and institutions, which had a religious significance in Judaism, were all turned into prophecies, types, and allegories, the true nature of which could only be discerned from the standpoint of Christianity. Thus his religious consciousness assumed an attitude of repulsion towards Judaism, but this by no means prevented it from turning towards the Old Testament. It was only by means of the Old Testament, in the contemplation of its prophetic and allegorical meaning, that he could reach the deeper, richer contents of his Christian consciousness. With all its affinity to Paulinism, his attitude towards the Old Testament is essentially different from the Pauline one: it is, as in the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews, rather Alexandrine than Pauline. The stress laid upon the typical, symbolical, allegorical, interpretation of the Old Testament (and this is the great characteristic of Alexandrine Judaism) tends to preserve the position of the Old Testament as the absolute source of truth. Thus, while Judaism is very greatly lowered in comparison with Christianity, and the difference between the two brought out in all its breadth, yet from this point of view it is felt to be all-important to maintain the identity of Christianity with the religion of the Old Testament. Paulinism finds the absolute contents of Christianity immediately in itself, in the spiritual consciousness which is awakened by faith, and for this consciousness everything connected with the Old Testament has only a very secondary importance. The other view loses itself so completely in the Old Testament way of thinking as to consider that there is no way of arriving at the truth of Christianity but through the Old Testament. Everything Christian was in the Old Testament before. The newness of Christianity is merely the newness of the consciousness which has arisen as to the contents of the Old Testament. The absolute

antagonism which Paulinism set up between law and gospel thus became more and more relative and subjective. Still, so long as the view that historical Judaism was only meant for a certain period was not supported in a more thorough way than it is by Justin, it remained wavering and unfixed. The idea by which the relation of Christianity to the Old Testament revelation was more definitely fixed, and which arose principally out of this, namely, the idea of the Logos, is certainly to be found in Justin, but this also is a mere point of connection. This want of fixedness in his idea of the Christian consciousness is what makes Justin's position as a whole so wavering and uncertain. This appears notably in his judgment on the Jewish Christians of his time. Considering his low estimate of Judaism we should expect a severer verdict upon those Christians who were nearer Judaism than Christianity. But with regard to those who, while they believe in Christ, at the same time observe the Mosaic law, Justin is not disposed to deny to them the hope of salvation, provided only they do not seek to bind Gentile Christians to observe it. He has no censure to express except for those Jewish Christians who declined to have any sort of association with Gentile Christians. But as for those whose opinion was weak, and who thought it necessary to add to hope on Christ and the observance of the commands of eternal and natural righteousness all the ordinances given by Moses on account of the hardness of the people's hearts, while, however, living together with Christians without demanding from them that they should be circumcised and keep the Sabbaths and other such things, he has no hesitation in acknowledging them as true brethren of the Christian community.¹ This view shows a liberal way of thinking in the direction of Judaism; but in the other direction Justin repels with the greatest strictness whatever does not harmonise with his opinion, so that our commendation of his liberalism is somewhat modified. The freer Pauline view of the use of meat offered to idols is so little to his taste, that he declares it to be no less abominable than heathenism, and will hold

¹ *Op. cit.* cap. 47.

no kind of communion with those who allow themselves the use of such meat.¹ This judgment is not directed against Pauline Christians, but only against Gnostics, yet it is expressed in broad and general terms; and if we compare it with the judgment he passes on Jewish Christians, we can see that with Justin, when all is considered, the scale dips rather on the side of Jewish than on that of Pauline Christianity. In other respects, Justin presents us with the same type of doctrine which is now to be regarded as the most prevalent expression of the Christian consciousness. On the one hand, Christ has taken upon himself, according to the will of God, the curse to which all men had made themselves liable by the transgression of the law, and has cleansed by his blood those who believe in him; but the condition of forgiveness of sins is not faith in the Pauline sense, but repentance, change of mind, observance of the divine commandments. Justin insists emphatically on this last point; man is to put forth in action his own moral power.² Christ is thus less the Redeemer than the Teacher and Lawgiver, as Justin expressly calls him.³ After all this it is superfluous to discuss the question whether Justin belongs to the Jewish Christian or to the Pauline tendency, whether his dogmatic standpoint is to be termed Ebionitism or Paulinism. He cannot be placed distinctly either on one side or on the other; his general position is too undefined and uncertain to allow of a definite place being assigned to him. He marks himself off from the Jewish Christians, and declares that his agreement with them is more outward than inward; but a much more striking thing than this is, that he nowhere gives any express recognition of Pauline Christianity. It is said to be beyond a doubt that he borrowed his view of the faith of Abraham from the Epistle to the Romans, and wished, by laying stress on the righteousness that is by faith, to represent himself as a Paulinist.⁴ If this be so, it is certainly remarkable that he never once mentions even the name of the apostle Paul, a fact which can scarcely be explained from his

¹ *Op. cit.* cap. 35.² Ritschl, 1st ed., p. 310, *sq.*; 2d ed., p. 304.³ Ὁ καινὸς νομοθέτης. Dial. cap. 18.⁴ Ritschl, p. 309; 2d ed., p. 303.

consideration for the Jews. If he be a Paulinist in fact, he does not wish to be one in name. What we have in him, though not expressly and openly declared, is just Catholic Christianity with its adjustment of those differences and party tendencies which had hitherto stood opposed to each other. The phenomenon we have before us here is entirely analogous to that which we have to deal with in the question as to Justin's Gospels. It may be beyond a doubt that Justin was acquainted with one of our Gospels or another, but he has named none of them. The thing is there, but there is no expression or name for it as yet, and as long as this is wanting, the fixity and definiteness which the conception of Catholic Christianity requires are still in the future. What we have in Justin is the transition to Catholic Christianity.¹

We have now to see how this transition was accomplished. Looking back to the commencement from which we started, we see

¹ In the second edition of his work, p. 310, Ritschl calls in question the position which I have assigned to Justin. With Justin, so Ritschl asserts, we have to recognise the predominant influence of Pauline ideas, though in a broken form, because this doctor is the first to bring to completeness the Pauline idea of the new law. With regard to Justin's Paulinism, I have to add the following remarks:—Justin distinguishes only two classes of Christians (*Dial. cum Tryph.*, cap. 35 and 80; cf. *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1857, p. 219, *sq.*): first, true orthodox Christians, disciples of the true, pure doctrine of Jesus, who believe in a resurrection of the flesh and a millennial reign; and second, those who confess Jesus and call themselves Christians, but eat flesh offered to idols, and assert that this does not compromise their Christianity, *i.e.* Gnostics; Justin afterwards calls them by this name. Now, in which of these two classes did he include the Pauline Christians? On this point it is asserted that Justin's judgment on the use of meat offered to idols cannot have been directed against Paul or against a party of Paul, because Paul himself rejected this license, and directly forbade participation in heathen sacrificial meals (1 Cor. x. 20, 21). But is not this a very one-sided interpretation of the passage in which Paul deals with the question (1 Cor. viii.-x.)? The apostle not only forbade the use of meat offered to idols, but also permitted it, and declared it to be a thing indifferent both in itself and for the man who practised it. He certainly expressed himself in such a way as to justify an appeal to his authority on this side. On this question Paulinism and Gnosticism approach each other very nearly. And a Christian like Justin, who was filled with the idea of the demonic nature of heathenism, might easily come to doubt how he ought to regard Paulinism. This explains in a very natural way his silence on the subject, without requiring us to infer anything more about Justin than that his opinion was still wavering and undecided.

that what determined the course of the development was not only the opposition of two radically different tendencies, but also the division of the two apostles who stood at the head of them. The two tendencies have now gradually approached each other; the original sharpness of the antithesis has been softened down; from both sides there is an effort to find a middle position in which the antitheses may be as far as possible united. But it was still uncertain how the apostles, whom their strife divided from each other, came to be reconciled and to adjust their differences. And till the assurance could be had that the founders of the Church held out to one another the hand of peace, and mutually recognised each other as brethren, there could be no firm foundation for the union of the two parties, nor any guarantee for the continuance of the ecclesiastical unity which had now been brought about. It was impossible to remain in doubt upon this point. And the fact that every doubt that might still be entertained upon this question disappeared just at the time when the Catholic Church came fully into existence in her chief representatives, is the clearest proof that this was the point in which the final completion of the Church was arrived at. In Irenaeus we find the first declaration of what by his time had come to be a standing fact, that the Roman Church, the greatest and the oldest, and the universally known, had been founded and ordered by the two most glorious apostles;¹ and Tertullian speaks of the Church, *cui totam doctrinam apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt, ubi Petrus passioni dominicae adaequatur, ubi Paulus Johannis exitu coronatur.*² From this time forward we find that with Irenaeus and Tertullian, with Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and with all the Church Fathers of the period, whose entire agreement in doctrine and tradition, and in all the principles of the work of the Church, shows that the Catholic Church was now actually existing, every recollection of a dispute or of a difference of opinion between the two apostles has completely vanished, and the authority of the one is as firmly established as that of the other. During this period the canon of the New Testament writings, which

¹ Adv. Haer. iii. 3.² De Praescr. Haer. c. 36.

was the essential basis of the Catholic Church now constituting itself, was gradually being settled. And the writings of the apostle Paul are those of whose canonical character there is the least doubt. This equalisation of the two apostles is no longer merely an object to be kept in view and worked out, as it was for the author of the Acts. What he aimed at is now actually attained, and has passed into the general belief of the Church. Indeed the idea of the Church, which was now coming to be realised, necessarily presupposed their equality. In the Roman Church itself it was held as a historical tradition that the two apostles had suffered martyrdom at Rome together, and at the time of the Roman Presbyter Caius, at the beginning of the third century, the places were pointed out where they had died as martyrs and were buried.¹ If this were a matter of pure historical fact, we should simply have to accept it as a piece of history. But the story, whether we consider its matter or its form, is opposed to all historical probability; indeed, there are good grounds to doubt whether Peter ever was at Rome at all; so that the historical interest of the story lies precisely in its unhistorical character. A tradition so entirely devoid of historical foundation must have been designed to serve some particular interest.² After what has been said, there is no need to discuss further what that interest was. It was felt desirable to bring the apostles as near as possible to each other—each was to have a part in the merit and the glory of the other; and as they had worked harmoniously together in life, so their death was to testify and seal the brotherly communion of their apostolic career. If we try to pick up the traces of the formation of the story, we shall at once see the efforts which were made to remove the various hindrances which stood in the way of the desired result. The two Petrine Epistles contain some remarkable data for such an investigation. The writer of the second Epistle, which is not only distinctly spurious, but one of the latest books of the canon, makes the apostle Peter, in drawing his Epistle to a close, speak of the apostle Paul as his beloved brother, who, according to the wisdom given unto

¹ Euseb. Eccl. Hist. ii. 25.

² Cf. Paul, i. 239, sq.

him, has written of the subject now under consideration, namely, the approaching catastrophe, in the same sense,—as also in all his Epistles, when he speaks of these things; in which there are some things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction (iii. 15, 16).¹ In what a brotherly spirit Paul is recognised here as an apostle, and what pains does his apostolic brother take to remove the prejudice which might still exist in some quarters against his writings, and the misinterpretations they were exposed to! Nay, the Epistles of Paul are here spoken of in the same category with the canonical Scriptures! There are other marks of a mediating tendency to be found in the Epistles; but this direct and pointed testimonial to the apostle Paul's apostolic authority is quite sufficient to prove the specific object which the writer had in view. He is merely giving utterance to a sentiment which the great majority of Christians must long have felt, that there was no reason for refusing to the apostle that recognition to which his writings and all that was remembered of his apostolic activity gave him the justest claim.² Even in the first Epistle of Peter we may discern this tendency: and the probability that this is so rises in direct proportion to the improbability of the apostolic origin of that Epistle. Peter cannot possibly have written an Epistle which the

¹ It is doubtful whether in 2 Pet. iii. 16 we ought to read *ἐν οἷς* or *ἐν αἷς*. But even if we read *ἐν οἷς*, the expression which follows, *ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς*, shows that the things to which the relative refers must be these things as they are spoken of in the Epistles of the apostle Paul; so that *δυσνόητα* refers exclusively to those Epistles. What was the writer thinking of when he spoke of *δυσνόητα*? Probably of Gal. ii. 11, *sq.*, as well as of other passages.

² Fellow-apostle of Peter is now the highest official predicate which is given to Paul from the Petrine side. Thus, for example, in the Apostolic Constitutions, 6, 8, where Peter says of Clement the *Ῥωμαίων ἐπίσκοπός τε καὶ πολίτης*, that he was *μαθητευθεὶς καὶ Παύλῳ* (the disciple not only of Peter but also of Paul), *τῷ συναποστόλῳ ἡμῶν καὶ συνεργῷ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*. At the beginning of the Epistle, the Gentile Christians are addressed by the author, speaking in the name of the Jewish Christians, as those whose faith had the same value and rested on the same foundation as that of the others. The Jewish Christian author, however, who writes in Peter's name, and puts forth this recognition as his parting declaration (i. 13, *sq.*), still lets Peter's superiority appear as an eye-witness of the glory of Christ: Paul is only extolled for his *σοφία*, iii. 15.

general opinion of scholars declares to be so Paulinising and so strikingly dependent upon the Epistles of the apostle Paul. This writing can only be regarded as an additional evidence of the general desire to obtain positive demonstrations of the agreement of the two apostles. This is the motive of the explicit statement at the close of the Epistle (v. 12), that it is written by the faithful brother Silvanus. It is quite in the style of such pretended apostolic Epistles to betray the tendency in which they are written by weaving in such minor incidents, and using the names of well-known assistants of the apostles. In this way Peter writes this Epistle by Silvanus, the well-known companion of the apostle Paul; while, on the other side, the Petrine Clemens is associated with Paul (Phil. iv. 3), and the same Mark whom Peter here calls his son also appears in Paul's company (Col. iv. 10). These companions and assistants seem to be meant as a kind of go-between from the one apostle to the other. How could there be any doubt as to the good understanding which prevailed between the apostles, if their friends and companions were equally intimate with one of them as with the other? The Babylon from which the apostle dates his Epistle can only mean Rome; and we are led to suppose that the interest-making for unity which gave birth to these Epistles existed mainly in the Roman Church. It was in this Church that the apostle Paul placed his hope of a better understanding, and many works which were intended to promote the same end, the Acts of the Apostles for one, were probably composed at Rome. In no other church were there such powerful motives to seek such a reconciliation as here, where the high claims of the two great apostles confronted each other; the weight of historical recollection enforcing those of the apostle Paul, while those of Peter derived equal weight from the respect with which he was early invested as the supposed head of the Roman Church. It also consists with the character of the Roman Church, where the Jewish Christian element preponderated from the first, that, with all the efforts that were made to equalise the two apostles, the apostle Peter still retains a certain precedence. In the fifteenth chapter of the Romans,

which there can be no doubt was added to the Epistle by a later hand, we find a carefully designed division of territory. On the one side, on the east, the apostle Paul only comes as far as Illyria; and on the other, the western side, he at once turns his eye to Spain; so that he appears in Rome only as one passing through (15-24). The only satisfactory explanation of this is that the writer designed to draw a geographical line, as it were, between the two apostolic fields, and reserved to another apostle what lay between Illyria and Spain, namely, Rome and Italy and the neighbouring Gaul.¹ Peter must be in every way the special apostle of the Roman Church; but, if this is conceded by the other side, the bond of brotherly unity between the two apostles is drawn the closer.² In no other Church was the consciousness of Catholicity developed so early, or carried out so consistently, as in the Church of Rome. And to that Church the great merit is due of having first made good this essential condition of Catholicism.

¹ Cf. *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1849, p. 493, *sq.*

² The two apostles act together in instituting the first bishops at Antioch and at Rome: *Apost. Const.* vii. 46. It is clear that it is only for the sake of an equal adjustment that Linus is placed between Peter and Clemens. The true successor of Peter at Rome is Clemens. Cf. the *Ep. Clem. adv. Jac.* ii. 19; *Tert. de Praescr. Haer.* c. 32; *Hieron. ad Jovin.* i. 7, *de viris illustr.* cap. 15. According to an acute surmise of Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1856, p. 309, *sq.*; 1857, p. 147, *sq.*, the key to the elucidation of the enigmatical passage, *Phil. iv.* 2, is to be found in the relation of the two apostles and their parties.

III.—JOHANNINE CHRISTIANITY.

FROM the sphere in which that great antithesis was developed which found its final adjustment in the co-ordination of the names of the two apostles, Peter and Paul, in the unity of the Catholic Church, historical thought turns to another side, on which the idea of the Catholic Church approached its realisation in a different way. How was it, we have now to ask, with the third pillar-apostle? Peter is now connected in fraternal union with the apostle Paul, and James belongs to the Church of Jerusalem alone. We have still to consider the apostle John and the circle of phenomena which culminate in the Johannine Gospel. We have already seen how he stands opposed to the apostle Paul in various relations, as one of the pillar-apostles, as the successor of the apostle in his sphere of labour at Ephesus, and as the author of the Apocalypse. Where we now are, however, it is the Johannine Gospel which forces itself on our attention as a new *modus* of development.¹ It is here that the well-known critical questions regarding this Gospel, its apostolic origin and its relation to the Apocalypse, appear in their great historical significance. The appearance of such a Gospel as this would be inexplicable at any other point of the historical development, but that which we have now reached, namely, the

¹ Cf. my *Krit. Unters. über die Kanon. Evang.*, 1847, p. 77, *sqq.*; Köstlin, *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1850, p. 277, *sq.*; 1851, p. 183, *sq.*; Hilgenfeld, *die Evangelien nach ihrer Entstehung und geschichtlichen Bedeutung*, 1854, p. 229, *sq.*; my essay: *die Johanneische Frage und ihre neuesten Beantwortungen* (by Luthardt, Delitzsch, Brückner, Hase) *Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 196, *sq.*; Hase, *die Tübinger Schule*, Sendschreiben an Dr. Baur, Leipzig, 1855, 1, *sq.*; my answer to this Sendschreiben, Tübingen, 1855, 8, *sq.*; Hilgenfeld, *das Urchristenthum in den Hauptwendepunkten seines Entwicklungsganges*, Jena, 1855, p. 6, *sq.*; my essay, *zur Johanneischen Frage, über Justin den Märtyrer* *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 209, and *Die Tübinger Schule und ihre Stellung zur Gegenwart*, Tübingen, 1859, p. 83, *sq.*

transition to the Catholic Church, marked in the Roman Church by the legend of the two apostles, Peter and Paul. The more closely we trace the progress of the historical development, the more must we be persuaded of the great difference, and in fact opposition, that exists between the Apocalypse and the Gospel, and feel that even the long life attributed to the apostle John is insufficient to bridge over the gulf between them. The argument for a Johannine authorship admits, by what is said of the long life of the apostle, that from the contents and the character of the Gospel itself, it cannot have entered into the progress of the historical development at an earlier period. But should not this argument lead a step further? What reason is there for assuming the early existence of the Gospel, when there is not the slightest historical trace of it for so long after? It would be an equally grave mistake, however, on the other side, to let the difference and opposedness of the two works blind us to the close connection which exists between them. That connection is entirely independent of the question of authorship. It is impossible to assume that the author of the Gospel was one and the same person with the author of the Apocalypse, but it is equally impossible to ignore the fact, that the evangelist conceived himself in the place of the Apocalyptic writer, and meant to use the weight of John's name for the purposes of his Gospel, since as apostle, as the author of the Apocalypse, and as the head who had presided for so many years over the Churches, John had become the highest authority for the Church of Asia Minor. Indeed there is more than a merely outward appeal to a venerable name; inner points of connection are not wanting between the Apocalypse and the Gospel; and we cannot but admire the breadth of true feeling and the delicate art with which the evangelist has seized those elements which led from the standpoint of the Apocalypse to the freer and higher standpoint of the Gospel, so as to spiritualise the Apocalypse into the Gospel. It is only from the standpoint of the Gospel that the attitude which its author took up towards the Apocalypse can be rightly apprehended. The author of the Gospel felt his standpoint to be a new and peculiar one, and essentially

distinct, both from the Pauline and the Jewish Christian; but this very fact forced upon him the necessity of giving a genuinely apostolic expression to the new form of the Christian consciousness. The names of Peter and Paul were already in current use to denote certain tendencies of the contemporary Christian world, and what name could suit the purpose of this writer better than that of the apostle John? Not only did this name possess the highest authority in the district in which the Johannine Gospel is generally assumed to have come into existence, but the apostle John was held in Asia Minor to be the author of the Apocalypse, a work presenting many points of connection for a higher conception of Christianity. If this is the only account that we can give of the connection of the name of the apostle with this Gospel, then the name denotes a new and peculiar form of the Christian consciousness, distinct from the two other tendencies, the Jewish Christian and the Pauline. We have now to consider in what its difference from these two tendencies consists.

The most characteristic difference lies in the idea of the Logos, in which the evangelist expresses most distinctly and immediately the absolute contents of his Christian consciousness. But this idea is only the unity of the different relations and antitheses amidst which the evangelist finds himself placed. His mode of view completely transcends the two other tendencies, and comprehends them, and with them Judaism and heathenism, in a higher, universally human unity. It is in his view of Judaism that the evangelist is furthest removed from the Apocalyptic writer. With the latter the name Jerusalem is of the first importance; the whole absolute significance of Christianity is bound up in that name. With the evangelist, on the contrary, the hour has already come when men are to worship the Father neither on Mount Gerizim nor at Jerusalem, but the true worshippers of God are those, and those only, who worship him in spirit and in truth (iv. 21). Heathenism and Judaism are thus alike negatively related to Christianity, as the one true and absolute religion. Judaism has, it is true, the advantage over heathenism, that in worshipping

God it knows what it worships, *i.e.* it is directed to the true object of the religious consciousness (iv. 22): in the knowledge of the one true God it has eternal life (xvii. 3). Thus the Messianic salvation can only come from the Jews (iv. 22), and there is, moreover, in the Scriptures of the Old Testament a progressive prophecy, and pointing forward to the Redeemer of the world (v. 46, vi. 45, viii. 56, xii. 41, etc.). But heathenism has also a certain share in the light of the Logos, which from the beginning shines in darkness, and gives light to all men (i. 9). If, as the evangelist emphatically asserts, Jesus was to die, not only for the Jewish people, but also that by his death he might gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad (xi. 52), there must have been such scattered children of God in the Gentile world too. The greater the unbelief of the Jews, the more does the evangelist, in the true Pauline spirit, see what was unfulfilled with the Jews fulfilled in the Gentile world. He attributes to the latter a much greater receptiveness for the Word of God and for faith in Jesus, and in several passages (cf. ch. iv. ; xii. 20) he expressly recognises the superiority of the Gentiles over the Jews in this respect. The one fold of the one shepherd points to the same idea. If the fold is not made up of Jews alone, but other sheep were to come to it, then the negative attitude of the Jews in their unbelief of the Gospel will leave the Gentiles to form the greater proportion of the fold. In fact, the unbelief of the Jews, which is worked out in all its phases, is one side of the great theme of the Gospel. That they did not believe in Jesus, in spite of all the manifestations of his glory, this is the result with which the evangelist brings his account of Jesus' public ministry to a close (xii. 37). An unbelief like this, increasing in all its forms from stage to stage, could only result in a catastrophe such as the death of Jesus was. The death of Jesus is thus the work of the Jews alone: all the grievous guilt of it falls upon them. The fact that this unbelief, in which the whole power of darkness is revealed, is the expression of the character of a whole nation, invests the crisis which follows in the death of Jesus with the deepest significance. In the Johannine

representation the Gospel narrative moves in the antithesis of the two principles, light and darkness, and in the death of Jesus these two powers finally join issue, and take up their proper relative position to each other. In the moment of this death, accordingly, the whole period of the Old Testament religious history reaches its conclusion. In order to make the death of Jesus appear in the full significance of such a crisis, the evangelist is careful to introduce all the Old Testament passages which may be taken as referring to the event. All the types and prophecies of the Old Testament which are still awaiting their accomplishment are now at last to be accomplished, in order that the Scriptures may be fulfilled (xix. 24, 28, 36, 37). The leading idea of the evangelist in connection with this scene is expressed in the last word of the dying Jesus, the word *τετέλεσται* (xix. 30)—“It is finished;” that is to say, everything is finished that had to happen to Jesus as the Messiah, in order to the fulfilment of the Old Testament (xix. 28). We must place ourselves at the point of view of this great historical contemplation, if we are to understand the evangelist aright in his description of the death of Jesus. What we have to recognise in the moment of the death of Jesus is the turning-point between the two religious economies, the passage from the Jewish consciousness of the Old Testament to the Christian consciousness of the New. The old is run out and has reached its end: the new has come into existence. With his last word on the cross he who was sent by the Father has finally discharged all the claims which Judaism and the Old Testament had a right to make upon him as the promised Messiah, and placed himself in a completely free relation towards them. Judaism and the Old Testament now belong to a period that has run its course. We cannot but regard it as an indication of the late origin of the Gospel, that the author sees Judaism so far behind him, and that the opposition of Judaism to Christianity is with him so entirely a standing and settled historical fact. At the standpoint at which the evangelist stands, everything positive in Judaism, such as the Sabbath and circumcision (vii. 22, *sq.*) has become completely indifferent. Even of the Mosaic law he

speaks in a very significant way as a thing that only concerns the Jews, that only they can call their law (viii. 17; x. 34). The law is given by Moses, but grace and truth have come through Jesus Christ (i. 17). The law is thus superseded by the Gospel; and since its grace and truth have been so decidedly and openly rejected by the unbelief of the Jews, Judaism has condemned itself. So entirely has the consciousness of the evangelist become detached from all connection with Judaism, that he is quite untouched even by that national interest which we find in the apostle Paul, and which, if there was little comfort in the present position of Judaism, yet opened up to it the hope of comfort and reconciliation in the future. Having placed Judaism and heathenism in opposition to each other, and expecting as he does that the glorification of the Son of Man which was wanting in Judaism is to take place in the Gentile world, he has to make the penalty of unbelief fall heavily upon the Jews, as with the writer of the Apocalypse it falls upon the Gentiles. With the apostle Paul the breach of Christianity with Judaism appears in the form of a dialectical process, the discussion is still going on, and the final position of parties is not yet decided; in the Johannine Gospel this breach has come to be an accomplished fact, and here we have to notice a further point in the apostle's view of Judaism, namely, that he defined more accurately than any one had done before the relation of the prophecies and types of the Old Testament to Christianity. This historical Judaism had certainly been greatly lowered and depreciated by previous writers, yet it had always been held that the Old Testament contained the archetypal idea of Christianity; and great stress had been laid on the prophecies, types, and symbols of the Old Testament; it was only through them that one could learn what Christianity really was; it was in contact with them that the truly Christian consciousness emerged. In this way of thinking Judaism and Christianity are so closely interwoven with each other, both in substance and form, that neither can exist without the other; only in the form which is contained in the Old Testament could the contents of Christianity be truly known. The

Johannine Gospel takes an important step in advance. The type is no longer held fast for the sake of what it signifies, and regarded as essentially one with it. On the contrary, so soon as the thing signified by the type has come, so soon as the reality appears of that which was typically present before, the type is declared to be quite extinct and done away, to be a form now quite destitute of meaning.

The weightiest and most significant of all the Old Testament types and symbols is for this evangelist the Paschal lamb. The writer's religious leaning nowhere declares itself so directly and emphatically as in the passage xix. 35-37. The supreme significance of the crisis of the death of Jesus is found in the fact that blood and water flowed from his wounded side. The reason why blood and water flowed from his side was that his side was pierced, and it was pierced because piercing was substituted for the breaking of the bones. With him there might be no breaking of bones, because the word of Scripture about the Paschal lamb was to be fulfilled in him, xix. 36. He himself then is the Paschal lamb. But if he is the Paschal lamb, he must be the true and real one, as distinguished from the merely typical one of Judaism, which has fulfilled its purpose, in accordance with the rule that the type ceases to be what it is as soon as the substance to which it refers has come. The point at which the typical Paschal lamb passed into the real and actual one in the crucified Christ is the turning-point at which Judaism ceased to be what it had hitherto been, its absolute importance came to an end, and Christianity took its place as the true religion. The water and blood which flowed from the side of Jesus as the true Paschal lamb is the symbol of the spiritual life which through the death of Jesus is communicated in all its fulness to mankind. We see how important it was for the evangelist to find in Christ the true and real Paschal lamb from the influence which this idea exercised on his representation of the Gospel history. We find here the only possible explanation of the well-known difference between him and the Synoptics with reference to the day on which Jesus died. If Christ

is the real and true Paschal lamb he must have died on the same day, and at the same time when the Paschal lambs of the Jews were killed according to their legal custom : *i.e.* not on the 15th Nisan, as the synoptic writers report, following no doubt a historical tradition, but on the 14th. If he died as the Paschal lamb on this day it follows further that he cannot have kept the feast of the Passover on this day with his disciples. If he ate a meal with his disciples before he died, it must have been on the preceding day, on the 13th ; and so this cannot have been the Passover. This, as every one knows, is also one of the features of the Johannine narrative in which it differs from the Synoptics. Thus Christians have nothing whatever to do with anything relating to the Passover. The whole institution is extinct and done away, by the fact that Christ died himself as the Paschal lamb on the eve of that Passover. By this fact Christianity has now completely disengaged itself from its connection with Judaism. It is true that in this point as in others, Judaism and Christianity are related as type and antitype. But what end is to be served by going back to the type and poring into the images and symbols of the Old Testament when the substance has come, that which is absolutely real, and besides which nothing else has any real significance ?

With the idea of Christ as the true and proper Paschal lamb another controversy is connected. It is noteworthy, that the greater the repulsion of the Christian consciousness toward Judaism, the more firmly does it hold to this idea : while on the other hand where it lives in Judaism and regards Judaism and Christianity as essentially one, the feeling on behalf of this idea diminishes : Christ may be held to be the Paschal lamb, but just in the same way as other types and symbols are said to apply to him. The first to call Christ the Paschal lamb of Christians is the apostle Paul. When exhorting the Corinthians, 1 Cor. v. 7, to purify themselves from all leaven that they may be a new lump, he gives as a reason, "For Christ is slain for us, as our Passover." Perhaps it was nothing more than a casual association of ideas that led him to this notion : he wrote the Epistle as it happened,

shortly before Easter, and may have meant nothing more by calling Christ the Paschal lamb than he meant by applying the figure of leaven to Christians. Yet he was the first to give utterance to the idea : and from his view of Judaism, the figure cannot have carried the meaning in his mind that Christianity was to be held in Judaism, but that it was to be separated from Judaism. He draws no further conclusions from the idea ; the only passage in his writings where we might think there is some reference to his notion of the Paschal lamb is his description of the last supper. In describing the institution of the last supper he gives not the slightest indication that it was the Passover which Jesus and his disciples were celebrating ; he speaks simply of the night in which the Lord Jesus was betrayed, 1 Cor. xi. 23. If then the tradition to which he appeals informed him that the meal was a Passover, the fact had no further interest for him. The main point was not the connection of the action of Jesus with the old Jewish festival custom, but only the new act with which Jesus was engaged, the institution of a new covenant. The apostle did not approve of that *παρατηρεῖν ἡμέρας καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἐνιαυτοὺς* (Gal. iv. 9) which was so closely connected with the observance of the Jewish festival customs : he repudiated it as a bondage to the powers of nature which still clung to Judaism, and was unworthy of the true religion. He could not then desire to connect the commemoration of the Lord, which was the object of the Lord's supper, with the annual return of the Jewish Passover. The Pauline author of the third Gospel agrees with the other two Synoptics in describing the last meal of Jesus with his disciples as the Passover : indeed he makes Jesus express a heartfelt desire to eat this Passover with his disciples before he suffered (Luke xxii. 15). But as if he felt this to be a sufficient fulfilling of all righteousness with regard to Judaism and the older apostles, he lays the more emphasis on the other side of the action of Jesus, and makes the institution of the supper (v. 19, 20) follow after the celebration of the Jewish Passover (v. 15-18), in such a way as to indicate that the former has now taken the place of the latter. The institu-

tion of the supper is a new act of Jesus, and is quite apart from the Passover. This is the first step of the transition from the synoptic representation to the Johannine, where the Jewish Passover meal is entirely excluded.¹ Thus the Johannine idea of Christ as the true and proper Paschal lamb has points of contact with Paulinism, so that we can scarcely doubt the existence of an inner connection. On the other side, however, the idea is completely strange to the two other Synoptics. Careful as these writers are in other cases to point out the fulfilment in Jesus of Old Testament types and prophecies, they quote no passage of the Old Testament referring to the Paschal lamb. The idea is also strange to the writer of the Apocalypse, and the difference is one which can only be explained from the deeper divergence of the two great tendencies. There may still, it is true, be some difference of opinion as to the sense in which the apocalyptic writer calls Jesus the *ἀρνίον ἐσφαγμένον*. The view that he meant the expression to designate Jesus as the Paschal lamb, has again found a resolute supporter.² But a careful consideration of the data which require to be considered for answering the question must lead to a different result. In no other passage of the Apocalypse is there the slightest allusion to the Paschal lamb: this single expression *ἀρνίον ἐσφαγμένον* is the only one in which such a reference is possible; and it can be referred equally well to the passage of Isaiah liii. 7. This passage is applied to Jesus in the Acts (viii. 32, 33), and this application of the words of the prophet was common and habitual. Even where Christ is called the Passover he is not termed the Paschal lamb, but the "lamb led to the slaughter" (*ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἀγόμενον*) of the prophet. It is therefore unquestionably much more natural to think of the latter in the Apocalypse.³

¹ Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin's*, p. 472, *sq.*; Köstlin: *die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 177; Hilgenfeld: *die Evangelien* (p. 213, *sq.*)

² Ritschl: 1st ed., p. 146, 2d ed., p. 121, *sq.*

³ Cf. the passages quoted by Ritschl from the Test. xii. Patr. Test. Benj. c. 3; Justin: Dial. c. iii. 72, and the fragment of Clement of Alexandria in the Chron. pasch. (ed. Bonn. p. 14.) There is little force in the argument that the *ὁρνὴ τοῦ ἀρνίου*, Rev. ix. 16, would be out of keeping with the Jesaïanic picture of the

The predicate *ἐσφαγμένον*, moreover, is given to the *ἀρνίον* in the Apocalypse with such emphasis, that it evidently implies more than is included in the idea of the Paschal lamb. The Paschal lamb could not be regarded as a propitiatory sacrifice at all; the slaying of it had no special meaning, and did not require to be mentioned; it was understood. The slaying spoken of here, on the other hand, must be one which can be combined with the full conception of suffering, quietly and self-devotedly endured for the sins of men, which is the leading thought in the passage of the prophet.

The idea, then, that Christ is the real and true Passover lamb is not to be ascribed to the apocalyptic writer, but to the evangelist. If this is so, we are at once placed in a position to observe a difference in which these two writers are very distinctly opposed to each other. In the second half of the second century there was a very active controversy in Asia Minor about the Christian celebration of the Passover. Not only was the Church of Asia Minor divided into two parties on this question, but the majority which represented the Church of Asia Minor found an opponent in the Church of Rome. The controversy reached its height when the bishop Polycrates of Ephesus and the Roman bishop Victor stood against each other on opposite sides of the question. The occasion thus arose which has provided us with our sources of information as to the remoter commencement and occasion of the controversy. The question first came to be discussed when Polycarp, the bishop of Smyrna, came to Rome, about the year 160, for the purpose of conferring with the Roman bishop Anicetus on various ecclesiastical affairs. One of these affairs was the question of Easter. The two bishops found it impossible to agree upon this point; Anicetus could not prevail upon Polycarp to refrain from observing that which he had observed with John the brother of the Lord, and with the other apostles with whom he had associated; nor could

meek and gentle lamb. If meekness and wrath were exclusive of each other, an *ὄργη τοῦ ἀρνίου* could not be spoken of at all. Nor does the passage from Jeremiah, xi. 19, which was doubtless present to the mind of the apocalyptic writer, where the prophet calls himself an *ἀρνίον ἄκακον φερόμενον τοῦ θύεσθαι*, point to the Paschal lamb.

Polycarp induce Anicetus to observe it; the latter appealing to the consideration that the custom of his predecessors must be maintained. Still they parted in peace, and the peace of the Church in general was not disturbed, although it was divided into two parties (into *τηροῦντες* and *μὴ τηροῦντες*).¹ It was otherwise, however, a few years afterwards. About the year 170 a violent controversy broke out at Laodicea, during the very days when the festival was being celebrated. The Church of Asia Minor was now divided in opinion, and controversial pamphlets appeared on both sides of the question. On the one side, Melito, bishop of Sardis, came forward; and on the other, Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, from whose work two fragments are preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale*. Clemens of Alexandria also wrote, on the occasion of the work of Melito, and therefore, as his opponent, on behalf of the view which Apollinaris supported.² This, however, was only the prelude of the controversy which broke out about the year 190, and now no longer confined itself to the Church of Asia Minor. It extended to Churches in other countries as well, and the Church of Asia Minor now found its great opponent in the Church of Rome. Eusebius tells us³ that many synods were held and many synodical writings composed. The Churches of Asia believed that their tradition bound them to observe the fourteenth day of the month (Nisan) as the festival of the *σωτήριον πάσχα*, the day on which the Jews were commanded to sacrifice the lamb. Fasting was always to be discontinued on this day, they held, without reference to the day of the week on which it might fall. The other Churches, on the contrary, observed, according to apostolic tradition, the rule which afterwards came to prevail, that fasting was to be discontinued only on the day of the Redeemer's resurrection. On the side of the Roman Church, of which Victor was then bishop, stood Palestine, Pontus, Gaul, Osrhoene, Greece. The Church of Asia Minor, on the other hand, held firmly to its old

¹ Cf. the letter which Irenaeus sent to the Roman bishop Victor in the name of the brethren of Gaul—Eusebius, E. H. v. 24, 25.

² Euseb. E. H. iv. 26.

³ E. H. v. 23.

custom. What high importance this custom had for the inhabitants of Asia Minor may be seen from the letter which Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, sent to the Roman bishop Victor in the name of the Asiatic bishops. He appealed to all the authorities of his Church, to the great princes of the Church who had fallen asleep in Asia, and who would rise again at the day of the coming of the Lord; to the apostle Philip, who fell asleep at Hierapolis, with his two daughters, one of whom rested at Ephesus; to the apostle John, fallen asleep at Ephesus, who lay on the Lord's bosom, and bore the emblem of the high-priestly office, and was a martyr and doctor; to Polycarp in Smyrna, bishop and martyr, and many others,—all of whom observed the fourteenth day of the Passover according to the Gospel. Nor would he, who had grown grey in the service of the Lord, who was versed in all the Holy Scriptures, depart from this day, or suffer himself to be intimidated by threats: greater men than he had said that we ought to obey God rather than men. In spite of this the Roman bishop Victor at once attempted to cut off at one stroke the Churches of Asia Minor and the neighbouring countries from the union and communion of the Church. He stigmatised them as heterodox in epistles in which he excommunicated all the brethren in these districts from the fellowship of the Church. But this act met with the disapproval even of those who, like Irenaeus in Gaul, agreed with the Roman Church upon the merits of the question, and affirmed, as that Church did, that the mystery of the resurrection should only be completed on the Lord's day.

The question as to the actual subject of the controversy has always been considered to be a very difficult one, and has accordingly received only very unsatisfactory answers. Nor is the view which is the only correct one, completely established even now; it has still to be defended against its opponents. It might seem natural to suppose that the party of Asia Minor, as a strictly Judaizing party, kept the Passover just in the Jewish fashion. But this was not the case; and there is nothing in the polemic of their opponents, who could not have passed over such a fact in silence,

to suggest that it was so. To the inhabitants of Asia Minor, as well as to other Christians, the Passover was the *πάσχα τοῦ σωτήρος* or the *σωτήριον πάσχα*, i.e. a Christian festival, the Jewish Passover transformed into a Christian festival in consequence of the way in which Jesus had kept it with his disciples before his passion. The characteristic of the Quartodecimans, as they were called, was simply that they adhered to the fourteenth day of the Jewish month Nisan in the same way as the Jews did, for whom that day was the day of the actual Passover, from which the following days were distinguished as the feast of *ἄζυμα*. This is the meaning of the term *τηρεῖν*, which is a standing phrase in the history of this controversy. The complete form, as we find it in the Epistle of Polycrates, is *τηρεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς τεσσαρεσκαδεκάτης τοῦ πάσχα*. This, however, does not make it clear what the exact significance of the day was to them. We find further light upon this point in the fact that they considered it necessary to bring the fast to an end on this day, while their opponents desired to carry on the fast which was customary before Easter to the Sunday on which the resurrection of Christ was celebrated. What, then, the day of the resurrection, Sunday, a fixed day, was for the one party, the fourteenth day of the month was for the other, on whatever day of the week that day might fall. But what was the 14th of Nisan to them, that they observed it in this way?

It is a too hasty conclusion to suppose that the contrast must be between the time of the resurrection and the time of the death, and that the whole question was simply at what point of time the boundary-line was to be drawn between the joy of the festival and the mourning of the fast, whether at the fourteenth, though it was earlier, or at Easter Sunday. According to this view, to the Christians of the West the day of the resurrection was the infinitely-important, never-to-be-forgotten day on which the little flock of believers had first been freed from all their fears, and saw the reality of redemption placed in the brightest light before them after the dreadful doubts and darkness of the fatal days preceding. This

day removed a crushing weight from the disciples, and was to them the true day of deliverance. For the Christians of the East, again, the day of the crucifixion had the prerogative; this day possessed the deepest significance in their eyes. Up to the point of death the sufferings of the Lord had been a painful and mournful thing, but with the moment of death the Lord's sufferings were at an end, the great work of atonement was completed, the eternal redemption was accomplished, and the glorification of Christ began. This may not have been clear at the moment to the minds of the disciples, but nevertheless it was the case. According to this view, the Western observance is to be characterised as more subjective, personal, individual, as more closely adhering to fixed and stereotyped historical traditions, and seeking to reproduce as closely as possible the whole of the outward features of the original Passion-week. The Eastern standpoint, on the contrary, appears to be more objective, dogmatic, universal, free and plastic; the Eastern observance seems to proceed from an endeavour to express the essence, the inner meaning of the act of salvation, and not merely a historical form of consciousness regarding it. What this observance looks to as the regulating principle in fixing the term of the celebration of the death, is not the outward outline of the first Passion-week, but an ideal consideration of religious history which lay in the events of that week.¹

This is without any historical foundation, and the whole question is too much removed from solid ground, and taken into the sphere of *a priori* presuppositions and abstractions. It cannot even be affirmed that the fasting could only have a meaning where the thought of the death of Jesus was the leading idea; and that the conclusion of the fast on the 14th must necessarily have involved the assumption that Christ died, and brought about the atonement, not on the 15th of Nisan, but on the 14th, as the Paschal lamb.² It is true that the customary fasting before Easter—and there was a difference about

¹ Weitzel: die Christliche Passahfeier der drei ersten Jahrhunderte, 1848, pp. 101, 110, 131.

² Ritschl: 1st ed., p. 250; 2d ed., p. 269.

this too, since, as Irenaeus says in his Epistle, some fasted one day, others two, others still longer, some forty hours during day and night¹—could only refer to the sufferings and death of Jesus. But it is an erroneous conclusion to think that because fasting is the sign of mourning, the end of the fasting, the eating which came in place of the fasting, necessarily expressed the opposite mood of mind, and that the eastern Christians therefore kept the day of Jesus' death as their day of rejoicing, instead of the day of the resurrection, which was the day of rejoicing kept by the Christians of the West.² Even if the death of Jesus brought up no other idea than that of the accomplishment of the atonement, still the sentiment of grief must have been uppermost, and it would be incomprehensible how the Christians of the East, if they meant their breaking

¹ Οἱ δὲ τεσσαράκοντα ὥρας ἡμερινὰς τε καὶ νυκτερινὰς συμμετροῦσι τὴν ἡμέραν, Euseb. 5. 24. This can only mean: they make forty hours by day and night equal to the measure of their day: they thought themselves obliged to have a period of fasting of forty hours, but counted these forty hours only as one day. Gieseler (K.g. i. 1, p. 240) proposes to read τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτῶν, and to interpret the passage thus: they measure out forty hours together with their day; i.e. they fast on the day which they keep as the Passover, or the day of the death of Christ, and with the hour of the death they begin a new fast of forty hours to the resurrection. This is clearly wrong; the Christians of Asia Minor left off fasting on the evening of the 14th.

² Steitz's observation (Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1859, p. 728) on this fasting is but one proof more of the wrongness of his whole view of the Easter celebration of Asia Minor. Steitz thinks that if the Church of Asia Minor intended its solemnity to be a commemoration of the Lord's last meeting with his disciples, their fasting on this day is quite incomprehensible. Why should they receive fasting what the disciples received from their Master during or after the meal on that evening? This would no doubt be exceedingly strange; but who asserts that this was the case? The main point of the view which Steitz is contesting is simply that the Easter festival of Asia Minor refers not to the Communion or Eucharist as such, but to Jesus' last meeting with his disciples. It is therefore quite beside the mark to bring in here the Church canon of fasting before the Communion; and it is in the highest degree natural to take this fasting as the expression of the mournful state of mind in which the disciples were on that day, which was the beginning of the time in which *sponsus ablatus est*. This coincides with what Steitz himself says of this fasting, p. 733, only that the object it has in view is not the death of Jesus, but the Lord, still sojourning in the circle of the disciples, but now going to meet his *πάθος*. Steitz might have saved himself many superfluous words, had he taken the trouble to understand his opponents' views more thoroughly.

off the fast as an expression of joy, could have chosen to do so on the day of the Passion. There must unquestionably have been some particular reason for the practice, and we have to ask what led them to celebrate this particular day, the 14th, not fasting but eating? And if they did not fast but ate on this day, must we not ask if the presumption is well founded that they kept this day as the day of Jesus' death? The answer to this question is not to be sought in the way of ingenious combinations; it lies plainly enough before our eyes in the fragments preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale*.¹ The reason of the difference is most distinctly expressed in a fragment of Hippolytus, who, speaking as a champion of the Western custom, puts into his opponents' mouth the following words: "What Christ did on that day was the Passover, and he suffered at that time. For this reason I likewise must do as the Lord did." To this Hippolytus answers: It is a mistake if one does not know that at the time the Lord did not eat the legal Passover when he suffered, for he was the Passover spoken of by prophecy, which was fulfilled on the appointed day. In another fragment also Hippolytus says: "As the Lord had already said that he would no more eat the Passover, he ate this meal before the Passover, but the Passover itself he did not eat; for it was not the time for him to eat it." From this it is as clear as possible, that the orientals kept the 14th, not as the day of the death of Jesus, but as the day on which he kept the Passover with his disciples. The question between them and their opponents was that between a doing or a suffering on the part of Jesus, or more distinctly, between *φαγεῖν* and *παθεῖν*. If Jesus ate the Passover on the 14th, he cannot have died on that day. His followers cannot therefore commemorate his death on that day; they must feel it incumbent on them to do what he did; not to fast, but to eat a meal in commemoration of the Passover observed by him. This meal naturally formed the conclusion of the fast that was customary before Easter. The western Christians again reasoned in the opposite way. Since

¹ *Chronicon Paschale*, in the Bonn edition of the *Corpus Scr. Hist. Byz.*; vol. i. 1832, p. 13, *sq.*

Jesus suffered and died on the 14th, he cannot have eaten the Passover on that day; and so there is no reason for concluding the fast on the day on which the Jewish Passover was held, or to take the 14th of Nisan into account at all in connection with the Christian celebration of Easter.

The fragments of Apollinaris of Hierapolis yield just the same result. He states the position of his opponents, the orientals, exactly as Hippolytus does: they say that the Lord ate the lamb with his disciples on the 14th, and himself suffered on the great day of the feast of unleavened bread. They read Matthew in such a way as to make him say exactly what they take to be the case. But the consequence of this is simply that their view does not agree with the law, and that they make the Gospels appear to be in conflict with the law. This conflict with the law that Apollinaris speaks of must mean that contradiction which the other party declared must arise between the Gospel and the law, if it appeared from the Gospels that Jesus did not die on that day on which as the Paschal lamb he needs must die, to fulfil the directions of the law about the slaying of the Passover. To the Western Christians then the meaning and importance of the controversy were derived from the idea of Christ as the Paschal lamb. This idea is distinctly expressed in the second fragment of Apollinaris, in such a way as to leave no doubt as to the nature of the argument supporting the Western view.¹

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 14. 'Ἡ ἰδ' τὸ ἀληθινὸν τοῦ Κυρίου πάσχα, ἡ θυσία ἡ μεγάλη, ὁ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἁμνοῦ παῖς Θεοῦ, ὁ δεθεὶς ὁ δῆσας τὸν ἰσχυρόν; καὶ ὁ παφεὶς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τοῦ πάσχα. The proofs are of this nature. To those drawn from Hippolytus and Apollinaris we have to add that of Clemens of Alexandria. In a fragment which is also preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale*, *op. cit.* p. 14, he says that in the preceding years the Lord ate the Passover with the Jews, but that on this occasion he announced himself as the Passover on the 13th, and then suffered on the following day (ὁ ἁμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἀγόμενος, αὐτὸς ἂν τὸ πάσχα καλλιεργεῖς ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων). In all these passages the point at issue is clearly presented to us, and we see also the important bearing which the data of the Paschal controversy have upon the question of the apostolic origin of the 4th Gospel. In order to get rid of this inevitable inference Weitzel asserts, *op. cit.* p. 16, *sq.*, that we have to distinguish between Catholic and heretical Quarto-decimans, and that the evidence of Hippolytus and the others only refers to the

What the opponents of the Christians of Asia Minor regarded as fixed before everything else was that Christ was the true and real Passover. From this it necessarily followed for them, since it was necessary that type and antitype, prophecy and fulfilment, should agree as closely as possible, that Christ died on the same

heretical party of them. There is thus an important difference between the Paschal controversy as it was in the year 170, and as it was in 190. In the year 170 Church did not stand against Church, the great representatives of the Church stood against an isolated party, against certain Judaizing Laodiceans, who appeared with their Judaizing Passover ritual in the year 170. But these pretended heretical Quartodecimans are a pure fiction. No proof of their existence can be brought forward; on the contrary, the whole character and history of the contest entirely excludes such a supposition. How clearly does the Epistle of Irenaeus show us that it is one and the same controversy from the very beginning! In this Epistle we find Polycarp and Anicetus at issue about the same alternative, *τηρεῖν* or *μὴ τηρεῖν*, as formed the subject of dispute between Polycrates and Victor, as we gather from the Epistle of the former. Had the Quartodecimans in question been a heretical, i.e. a Judaizing party, we should have had some clearer proof of their Judaizing tendency. But the dispute was not about the Passover as such, it was not proposed to keep it with the Jews as a Jewish festival. The dispute was about the action of Jesus in connection with the Passover, whether it was at a Passover that he ate his last meal with his disciples. The 14th was to be kept, not for the sake of the Passover, but in remembrance of Jesus and what he had done. This is the plain meaning of the passages which we have quoted. What was there here that was specifically Judaistic, and that was not to be found with the Catholic Quartodecimans as well? The Church knew nothing of heretical Quartodecimans in the sense here assumed. This may be seen from a passage in the newly discovered *Philosophoumena* of Origen (vii. 18, ed. Miller, p. 274, *sq.*), where he speaks of those who keep the Passover on the 14th day of the first month, *κατὰ τὴν τοῦ νόμου διαταγὴν*, and justify the practice by referring to the curse of the Mosaic law, but do not consider the significance of the true Paschal sacrifice in Christ and the words of the apostle Paul, Gal. v. 3. In the same way as Apollinaris and Hippolytus accused their opponents of contentiousness and ignorance, these persons are called *φιλόνοιχοι τὴν φύσιν, ἰδιῶται τὴν γνώσιν*; but not as Judaistic heretics; on the contrary, the testimony of perfect orthodoxy in other respects is expressly accorded to them: *ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἑτέροις οὗτοι συμφωνοῦσι πρὸς πάντα τὰ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδεδομένα*.

Cf. on the Paschal controversy my *Krit. Unters. über die kanon. Evang.* p. 269, 334, *sq.*, 353, *sq.*, and the essays in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1847, p. 89, *sq.*; 1848, p. 264, *sq.*; Hilgenfeld: *der Paschastreit und das Evangelium des Johannes mit Rücksicht auf Weitzel's Darstellung*; *Theol. Jahrb.* 1849, p. 209, *sq.*, and *Der Galaterbrief*, Leipzig, 1852, p. 84, *sq.* In spite of its evidently incorrect assumption, Weitzel's view is a very convenient sanction for refusing to accept the results of recent criticism; and it is repeated by Lechler in the work quoted, p. 52, who how-

day on which the Jewish Passover was slain. But if the 14th was only distinguished as the day of the death of Jesus, and if what was meant by Jesus dying as the Passover was that He finally and for ever removed the old, that had reached its fulfilment, by placing in its stead the new, that had now come into being, then there could be no need to retain the 14th as the standing anniversary of the death of Jesus. To the Christian festival-calendar the only possible fixed day was the Sunday of the resurrection. Thus, while for the Easterns the 14th was the day of a standing festival, and everything else had to be arranged with reference to that day, with the Westerns the days of these yearly festivals were fixed on the opposite principle: the day of the death depended on the day of the resurrection, and as the latter was always a Sunday, the former was always a Friday. Though the Roman custom more and more gained the upper hand, yet the difference continued to exist even in later times, and was in fact one of the causes of the Council of Nice, for even at that time there were several ecclesiastical provinces in the

ever fails to apprehend correctly the point at issue. In his second, thoroughly revised, edition of 1857, Lechler brings forward only what is quite familiar, and was refuted long ago. For the literature of the question cf. Steitz: *die Differenz der Occidentalen und der Kleinasiaten in der Passahfeier, auf's Neue kritisch untersucht und im Zusammenhang mit der gesammten Festordnung der alten Kirche entwickelt*, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1856, p. 721. Against this my Dissertation on the Johannine question in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 242, *sq.*, and Hilgenfeld, p. 523, *sq.* In defence of his view or of Weitzel's hypothesis, Steitz gave certain further observations in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1857, p. 741, which I did not neglect to answer; see *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.*, 1858, p. 298, *sq.* The question has been so long the subject of investigations and so thoroughly discussed on both sides that two points may now be regarded as established results against which it is not likely that any new argument of importance will be adduced. These are—(1.) The Passover on the 14th was not consecrated to the Redeemer dying or already dead, but to the Lord now entering into his sufferings (his *πάθος*), and still sitting in the midst of his disciples. (It was this, as I pointed out when I last wrote on the subject, that filled these last moments with recollections of such infinite tenderness. Hence it was that for the Christians of Asia Minor, everything was wrapped up in that one day, and that they would know nothing of any consideration that would have detached them from the sentiment so intimately connected with that day. Everything was concentrated on the few hours of the Passover held after the fast in memory of Jesus' last supper. Far from being a festival of joy, the æsthetical antithesis to the fast just brought to a conclusion, as some think it must have been, it must have been kept in the solemn

East in which the Passover was kept at the time when the Jews kept it.¹ The Judaism of the Quartodecimans had given offence from the first; and the same anti-Jewish feeling still finds expression in the declaration of the Council of Nice, that it was improper to be guided by the custom of the unbelieving and hostile Jews. All the Christians of the East, who had hitherto been keeping the Passover with the Jews, were in future to celebrate it in conformity with the usage of the Roman Church. Indeed, so strong was the desire to have nothing in common with the Jews in this festival, that when the Easter full moon fell on a Sunday, Easter was to be celebrated not on the day of the full moon, but on the following Sunday.

So lively and universal was the commotion aroused by this question not only in Asia, but among the Christian Churches of the age in general. And this makes it impossible to disregard the attitude of the Gospel of John with regard to the dispute. It takes its stand most decidedly upon the side of the Western tradi-

mood appropriate to a supper of farewell, but a mood lifted above mere sorrow by the deepest sentiment of piety.) (2.) The pretended heretical Quartodecimans are utterly unvouched for by any historical evidence; in fact they are simply a makeshift of apologetics. In his "last words," in which he (Steitz) finally wound up his investigation into the Paschal controversy viewed aesthetically and otherwise (*der ästhetische Charakter der Eucharistie und des Fastens in der alten Kirche*, Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1859, p. 716 *sq.*), he sums up his result as follows, p. 737: "There is every reason not to set too high a value on the statements of Polycarp and Polycrates about John. The Church of Asia Minor will have received from the beloved disciple the fact attested by the fourth Gospel, that Christ died on the 14th of Nisan, and perhaps also the usage of celebrating this day as the standing anniversary of his death; but there is no doubt that the manner of celebration belongs to a later age, and was formed by a process of historical development, though probably upon the basis of the fourth Gospel (cf. xvi. 6, 7; xix. 30.)" This is a view of history dominated and limited by the "beloved disciple;" and it ends in simply denying the value of historical evidences, such as those of Polycarp and Polycrates, which do not suit the writer's purpose, while the question under discussion is no nearer a solution at the conclusion of the argument than it was at the beginning.

¹ Cf. Athanas. de Syn. 5, where there is special mention of *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Συρίας καὶ Κιλικίας, καὶ Μεσοποταμίας*, as those who *ἐχώλεον περὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν καὶ μετὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐποίουν τὸ πάσχα*. Cf. Eusebius, de vita Const. iii. 5. 18. Socr., H. E., i. 9.

tion. It is evidently with deliberate purpose that it arranges its account of the death of Jesus in such a way as to preclude the idea that his last meal was the Passover.

In xiii. 1 it says expressly, that before the feast of the Passover Jesus ate a supper (δεῖπνον, not τὸ δεῖπνον) with his disciples, which, notwithstanding its difference in many respects from the supper of the Synoptics, yet coincides with theirs in being the last he ate. The repeated allusions, again, to the festival as still approaching, as xiii. 29, xviii. 28, seem to be designed to prevent all doubt upon the point that this meal was the same meal eaten by Jesus with his disciples on the night of his arrest, as that which is described by the Synoptics, only with the difference that it was not the Passover. On this point especially, there is such a radical discrepancy between the synoptical and the Johannine narratives, that there is scarcely another exegetical result so firmly established as the utter futility of all attempts to interpret the one account into the other.

And yet this same apostle John is represented as one of the chief witnesses to the genuinely apostolic origin of the tradition of Asia Minor—the apostle to whose authority the venerable Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, appealed. That bishop calls to witness his grey hairs and all that was holy and worthy of reverence to him, in such a way as to make it as impossible to question the historical trustworthiness of his testimony as it is to impugn the above-mentioned exegetical result. In what other way can this obvious contradiction be overcome than by supposing that the author of the Gospel was a different man from the apostle John, the author of the Apocalypse?¹

¹ According to Gieseler, *Lehrb. der K.G.*, 4th ed., i. 1, p. 241, *sq.*, this contradiction admits of an easy solution. He says: "At the outset the Jewish Passover was kept up in the Christian Churches only with the difference that it was referred to Christ, the true Passover (1 Cor. v. 7). John found this practice existing at Ephesus, and left it unchanged. He corrected it in his Gospel only so far as to preclude the belief on which it may have proceeded that Christ ate the Passover with the Jews on the day before his death: he made it appear distinctly, that Christ was crucified on the 14th of Nisan. But this did not make it necessary to

The historical datum which is given to us in the information we have about the Paschal controversy does but confirm the result which rests on so many other incontrovertible grounds. These all combine to place the origin of the Gospel of John at a later date, and we now conclude, that it can only have arisen within the circle of those movements which were called forth by the Paschal controversy, and must have proceeded from the same interest which caused the Church of Rome to take up more and more an attitude of opposition to the Churches which still adhered to the original Jewish-Christian tradition. There is no doubt that historical tradition was on the side of the Quartodecimans of Asia Minor, and that in this view they were right. We have no reason for 'doubting the trustworthiness of the testimony to which they appealed in proof of the apostolic origin of their tradition; and the synoptic account of the death of Jesus, which coincides with this tradition in every respect, produces the impression that it is the oldest transmitted record. All the testimony is agreed upon the point that Jesus died on the 15th of Nisan, and kept the Passover on the 14th with his disciples.

The other tradition, according to which Jesus died on the 14th, the day of the Passover, and his last meal was not the Passover, proclaims itself as of a later origin. It is true that in the Church of Rome Anicetus appealed against Polycarp to the tradition of his

change the celebration at Ephesus; on the contrary, the 14th of Nisan was now shown to be the true Passover-day for Christians as well: the fulfilment of the type fell on the same day with the type itself." As if the contradiction did not lie in this very point, that he laid the utmost stress on the 14th, as the day of Christ's death, and yet was so indifferent as to the mode in which the day was celebrated! How could he allow the contradiction of the *φαγεῖν* and *παθεῖν* on the same day to remain unremoved? How could he sanction that contradiction by personally taking part in the Passover of Asia Minor, while in his Gospel he did all in his power to oppose it? And what brought him to correct the belief he found existing in Asia Minor, and thereby to run counter to the universal tradition, confirmed by the Synoptics, according to which Christ died on the 15th? One who supposes that the self-contradiction into which the apostle John would thus have been involved can be got rid of in this easy way, must have failed entirely to see how radical a difference was involved in the question of the day of the death of Jesus.

predecessors. But the Epistle of Irenaeus to Victor, the bishop of Rome, shows that the line of bishops of Rome, whom Irenaeus designated as *μὴ τηροῦντες* (though at the same time they stood in friendly relations to the *τηροῦντες*), could not be traced further than Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus, and Xystus. The last of these, Eusebius tells us (E. H. iv. 4), was bishop of Rome during the time of Hadrian from the third to the twelfth year of the reign of that emperor (cir. 120-129). Whatever the causes may have been which combined to give the Church of Rome a more and more anti-Jewish tendency during the course of the second century, there is no doubt that the inner reason was the freer development of the Christian consciousness. The principal expression of this tendency was in connection with the Old Testament typology, the relation between type and antitype coming to be more exactly defined. Justin, though he holds the Passover of the Old Testament to be a type of Christ, yet agreed with the synoptic version with regard to the day of the death of Jesus.¹

But when it was emphatically maintained against opponents that Jesus did not keep the Jewish Passover, it became necessary to look for grounds to justify this assertion. And the only way to justify it was to define the relation of type and antitype more accurately. The more completely the type and antitype coincide, the less is it possible for the type to retain any importance, when once the full reality of the antitype has taken its place. This became the fundamental and guiding thought upon the subject: we find this thought also in the Gnostic writers of the period, when they attempt to define the exact significance of the types and symbols of the Old Testament.² Allegorical interpretation being regarded as

¹ Dial. c. Tryph. c. iii.; cf. c. 40. In the latter passage the manner in which Justin considers the Passover to be a type of Christ is especially deserving of notice. He sees the typical element only in the blood which was put upon the houses, and in the form of the cross, which the lamb presented when it was being roasted. He thus leaves quite unnoticed that sign to which the evangelist, xix. 36, attaches the highest importance. How could he have done so if he had been acquainted with the Gospel of John?

² Cf. in particular the Epistle to Flora of the Gnostic Ptolemaeus in Epiphanius, Haer. xxxiii. 5. *Πάντα ταῦτα*, Ptolemaeus says of the Old Testament types,

the key to the Scriptures, and as the highest knowledge, those who occupied this point of view, and thought it enabled them to gain a deeper insight into the relation of type and antitype, considered themselves to be standing at a higher stage of Christian knowledge than others. This is the point of the charge which we find in the fragments of Apollinaris and Hippolytus, where they speak of the ignorance and contentiousness of their opponents, since being destitute of that true insight into the subject which is possible only to those who know how to distinguish correctly between type and antitype, and to place them in their true relation to each other, they yet obstinately adhere to their alleged tradition, and contend against their opponents with regard to that which the latter believe themselves to understand far better.

In this view of it the Paschal controversy is one of the most important stages in that series of endeavours which the Church put forth in the second century to indicate the positions which had been attained in the freer development of the Christian principle, by purifying and disengaging itself from the elements of Judaism that still adhered to it. The Gospel of John is essentially a product of these movements, and is the purest expression of that higher form of the Christian consciousness which issued out of this process of development. It regards the breach of Christianity with Judaism as an accomplished fact, and the attitude which it takes up to Jewish Christianity is a similar one. Since Christ has been sacrificed as the Passover, the Passover no longer concerns Christians. The Passover is now a purely Jewish festival: for Christians it is abrogated (*τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, ii. 13, vi. 4, xi. 55). This is part of the general view of this Gospel, according to the language of which even the law is merely the law of the Jews. What led the author of the Gospel to identify himself in this way

among which the Passover is specially named, *εἰκόνες καὶ σύμβολα ὄντα τῆς ἀληθείας φανερωθείσης μετετίθη, κατὰ μὲν τὸ φαινόμενον καὶ σωματικῶς ἐκτελεῖσθαι ἀνθρώποις, κατὰ δὲ τὸ πνευματικὸν ἀνελήφθη, τῶν μὲν ὀνομάτων τῶν αὐτῶν μενόντων, ἐνῆλλαγμένων δὲ τῶν πραγμάτων.*

with the apostle John can have been nothing but his consciousness that he had reached a higher stage of development, where all particularism was left far behind. John alone—but only John as spiritualised in the sense of this Gospel—is for the author the highest expression of the Christian consciousness. In the Johannine Gospel, then, John is distinguished as the most intimate disciple, as the beloved disciple who was nearest to Jesus—a thing which is quite peculiar to this Gospel. Indeed this is carried so far as to assign to John a position in which Peter himself has need of his mediation, and is designedly represented in a subordinate position to him. This is a most obvious protest against the primacy attributed to the apostle Peter by the Jewish Christians.¹ The John who thus claims a position above Peter himself is not a historical but a merely ideal person. The evangelist's conception of the Spirit tends in the same direction. The Spirit only comes in his fulness after the close of the earthly life of Jesus, and thus stands, as the universal Christian principle, high above the personal authority even of the apostles. In the difference which existed between Paulinism and Judaism on this subject, the Johannine Gospel goes a step beyond even Paulinism.²

The same is the case with his doctrinal system. The Jewish-Christian and the Pauline doctrine are here blended together in a higher unity. Faith has the same inwardness in which its value consists with Paul; but its object is not the death of Jesus with its efficacy for the forgiveness of sins, but the whole person of Jesus as the incarnate Logos; or, since Jesus as one sent cannot be thought

¹ Cf. my *Krit. Untersuch.* p. 320, *sq.*, 377, *sq.*

² The Spirit is sent forth to operate unrestrictedly after the glorification of Jesus, and represents the person of Jesus himself. He who believes on him, the Jesus of John says, out of him flow rivers of living water (vii. 38). It is the sphere of pure spirituality into which this Gospel transports us. As Paul by his vocation broke in upon the old apostolic circle, so the bearers and possessors of the apostolic spirit are now said to be the believing disciples in general: cf. xvii. 20, *sq.* According to the Johannine view, therefore, it is by no means an essential condition with regard to the origin of such a Gospel as that of John, that its author should be an apostle.

of apart from his intimate oneness with him who sends him, the object of faith is God himself. The relation of Jesus, as the Son to the Father, is the absolute type for the whole relation of man to God. What the Son is absolutely, those who believe on him are to become through his mediation. In the same relation in which the Son stands to the Father believers also stand not only to the Son, but through his mediation to the Father also. The ruling principle of the relation is love actively manifesting itself by unreserved devotion, and by following the Divine will. The highest absolute principle of this love is the love of the Father to the Son, and of God to the world. Love is thus the dominant conception from which the Johannine mode of view sets out; and this is the point at which the Johannine doctrine diverges from the Pauline. Lofty as is the apostle Paul's conception of the love of God, yet it results from his view of the law, that love always has righteousness standing over against it. Man cannot get away from the law without satisfaction being rendered to the claim which the law is entitled to put forward against him, without his debt being cancelled, his ransom paid. From the standpoint of the Gospel of John we see that, on the one hand, the law has come to be at such a distance from the present field of vision, that its claims may as it were be regarded as antiquated—there is no occasion for trying to arrive at a definite understanding with the law. On the other hand, the view taken of the whole person of Jesus does not admit of any one feature of his work or personality being insisted on so much more than the rest, as that the whole work of redemption should centre in his death. That death is redemptive only to the same extent as the whole manifestation of Jesus is redemptive. What the fact of the death is with Paul the simple personality of Jesus is here—the person of Jesus in its absolute significance. To gain a correct idea of the relation of the Johannine standpoint to that of Paul, we must consider that all those antitheses, through which Paulinism was obliged to fight its way, were to the author of the Johannine Gospel a part of a far distant past. Faith and works are merged in love, their higher unity. Jewish particularism, with all the

antitheses connected with it, disappears in that general antithesis which forms the background of the Johannine view of the world—the antithesis of the two principles, light and darkness, which exercise a determining influence on the moral as well as the religious world.

At this stage the development of the Christian principle has reached its definite goal within the sphere which we are at present considering. Christianity is established as a universal principle of salvation; all those antitheses which threatened to detain it within the narrow limits of Jewish particularism are merged in the universalism of Christianity. This has come about at two different points, at each of which a series of phenomena has run its course, each independent of the other. The one point is to be found in the Church of Rome; the other in the Gospel of John. At both these points the Christian consciousness is working out its freer development, and in both it has the same goal before it, the realisation of the idea of the Catholic Church. In the Gospel of John this process of development presents itself to us on its ideal, in the Church of Rome on its practical side. In the former the development of the Christian consciousness already bears the character of a Christian theology: in the latter the great question is to realise the practical idea of the Church. On the one side the movement proceeds from a definite point: we stand upon the firm ground of historical reality; there are definite antitheses which it is sought to reconcile: on the other side the whole mode of thought floats in the sphere of a transcendental idealism. We do not even know where the Gospel of John came into existence. It is true that it is connected in many ways with the Church of Asia Minor and with the controversies which during the course of the second century made that Church the centre of the ecclesiastical movement; yet both as a whole and in many of its individual features it exhibits such a decidedly Alexandrian stamp, and so close an affinity to the later Alexandrian theology, that we cannot avoid the conclusion that it represents the Alexandrian tendency, and that in whatever part of Christendom it may have come into existence,

we have to seek the root out of which it grew chiefly in this direction. In spite of its ideal and theological character it does not lose sight of the practical task involved in the idea of the Church, as when it speaks of the one fold and the one shepherd. It agrees with the Roman Church in its broad anti-Judaistic tendency; its most direct point of contact with that Church, however, lies in the common opposition of the Church and of the Gospel to the Judaism of the Quartodecimans of Asia Minor. The endeavour after unity had already been manifested in the Church of Rome in the brotherly agreement effected between the two apostles Peter and Paul; and the same spirit imposed it on that Church as a necessary task to work out its views of Catholic unity against this relic of the old tenacious adhesion to Judaism. There must no longer be any such declared Judaists as the Quartodecimans still were; and thus another element, which originally formed a link of connection between Christianity and Judaism, but in regard to which Christianity desired no longer to be associated with Judaism, was now eliminated from the Christian Church. Thus it was declared that whoever should cling with the old tenacity to any one of the Jewish elements from which the Christian consciousness in the course of its development had gradually disengaged itself, placed himself thereby outside of the pale of the Catholic Church at least, if not of Christianity. This is the idea which now, from the end of the second century onwards, came to be connected with the term Ebionites. Ebionites at this part of Church history are those Jewish Christians who at this later period, even after a Catholic Church had come into existence, exhibited all those characteristics which had originally found their own place within the Christian community, and had even been regarded as an essential part of Christianity, but which the Catholic Church at a later time no longer sanctioned.¹

The Ebionites, when we find them as a sect disowned by the Catholic Church, are just what the Jewish Christians were originally, as distinguished from the Pauline Christians. Irenaeus,

¹ Cf. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengesch.*, 2d ed., p. 64.

who is the first to speak of the Ebionites as a sect not belonging to the Catholic Church,¹ and Epiphanius, who gives a description of such remainders of the party as still survived at his time,² specify the same features as were originally characteristic of Jewish Christians generally. The account given of them by Irenaeus they worship Jerusalem as if it were the house of God, is a very pointed indication of their view of the absolute importance of Judaism. The Ebionites of Epiphanius held firmly to circumcision; they went so far as to regard it as the seal and characteristic mark not only of the patriarchs and of the just men who lived according to the law, but of the followers of Christ, who (they said) was himself circumcised.³

By their hatred toward the apostle Paul and their express rejection of his Epistles, the Ebionites were afterwards distinguished from the more tolerantly disposed Nazarites, of whom at least this is not stated. The accounts we have of the Ebionitic Passover imply that they observed the Jewish festival in the same manner as the Quartodecimans. Epiphanius asserts that the Ebionites did not arise till after the destruction of Jerusalem. This statement, however, is completely unhistorical, and is a mere inference from the assumption that nothing afterwards deemed heretical could have been an original part of orthodox Christianity. The Ebionites did not become a sect till later; even Justin does not regard them as a sect. But an examination of their principles, doctrines, and usages, while it shows us in many points the harsh sectarianism of their attitude, points at the same time to a very close identity and connection with Jewish Christianity. So much is this the case that it cannot be deemed an unjustifiable use of the name to say that Jewish Christianity in general was a kind of Ebionitism. In

¹ Adv. Haer. i. 26.

² Haer. xxx. 1, sq.

³ Against Ritschl, who (*op. cit.*, 2d ed. p. 172) regards the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs as a product of Nazarism, Hilgenfeld maintains (*Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theol.* 1858, p. 287, sq.) that the Nazarites and Ebionites are not so much two separate sects of Jewish Christianity as rather different modifications of the old hostility against Paulinism as it softened down to a more tolerant attitude towards Gentile Christianity.

the ordinary and narrower sense of the name, however, it denotes that form of primitive Christianity which by no other action than its own came to be detached from the community of the Catholic Church, because its adherents were unable to keep pace with the development of the Christian consciousness in its advance beyond Jewish Christianity.

PART THIRD.

CHRISTIANITY AS AN IDEAL PRINCIPLE OF THE WORLD; AND AS A
REAL PHENOMENON EXISTING UNDER HISTORICAL CONDITIONS; OR,
GNOSTICISM AND MONTANISM, AND THEIR ANTITHESIS,
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

I.—GNOSTICISM AND MONTANISM.

I. GNOSTICISM.

WITH the name and the notion of "Gnosticism" (the reason for coupling it with Montanism in the title cannot be explained till afterwards) we enter upon a totally different field of the history of the early Church from that which we have hitherto been discussing. The question is no longer whether Christianity is a particular or a universal principle of salvation, or as to the conditions on which the Christian salvation is to be obtained. The practical interest is no longer merely that of breaking through and putting aside the barriers that impede the free and more universal development of Christianity. The circle of vision is completely changed. God and the world, spirit and matter, absolute and finite, the origin, development, and end of the world: these are the conceptions and antitheses into the sphere of which we are now transferred. In a word, Christianity is now to be apprehended not as a principle of salvation, but as a principle of the world. The phenomena with which we have now to deal have their own point of commencement, form a circle by themselves, and have a character of their own. So much is this the case, that in fact it is merely

the name of Christianity that connects them with the rest of the phenomena which form the history of the early Church. Yet on the other hand they are not without weighty significance for the history of the development of the Catholic Church. It is involved first of all in the very idea of the Catholic Church that she should seek to rise above everything particular, and merge it in the universality of the Christian principle; but on the other hand it is a not less essential part of her office to maintain and hold fast the positive elements of Christianity. In fact, what constitutes her a Catholic Church is that she stands in the middle to harmonise all tendencies together, and rejects the one extreme as much as the other. Had not the idea that developed itself out of Christianity, the idea of the Catholic Church, overcome the particularism of Judaism, Christianity itself would have become a mere sect of Judaism. But on the other side, on the side where it came in contact with heathenism, it was threatened by a danger no less serious, viz., that ideas would come to operate upon the Christian doctrines, under the influence of which they would fade away into vague and general abstractions, so that the Christian consciousness spreading out in limitless expansion would entirely lose its specific historical character. Now this was the tendency of Gnosticism, and the general account which we have to give of Gnosticism in view of this tendency is, that it regarded Christianity not in the first instance as a principle of salvation, but as the principle that determines the whole development of the world. Thus the interests out of which it arose were those of speculation and philosophy rather than religion; and it points back to philosophy as the highest outcome of the human spirit in the Gentile world.

This suffices for a general indication of what Gnosticism is. But when we attempt to give a more particular account of the nature and development of the conception, we find that, even after all the discussion that has taken place on the subject, especially of recent years, this is by no means an easy or simple task. It is still an unaccomplished task, to seize, amidst so much that is indefinite, vague, merely circumlocutory, and only partly true, those points

that furnish a clear conception of the thing itself. The most usual course is to conceive Gnosticism as being in the first instance theological speculation. This is Gieseler's¹ account of it. He finds the philosophical basis which serves to explain it partly in the old problem of the origin of evil, and partly in the development of philosophical thought with reference to God. In working out the idea of the Supreme Deity, he says, philosophy found it more and more difficult to regard him as the creator of the world, and became more and more inclined to derive the imperfect good in the world from inferior beings, and the evil from an evil principle. These ideas found support in the Christian view of Christianity, Judaism, and Paganism, as the perfect, the imperfect, and the evil.

Neander² starts from the aristocratic spirit of the ancient world, from the distinction drawn between those who know and those who believe, and from the eclectic character of Gnosticism, and goes on to say that, "as soon as Christianity entered into man's intellectual life, it could not fail that a need should be felt to attain to a clear consciousness as to the connection of the truths given by revelation with the previous intellectual possessions of mankind, and also as to the inner connection of Christian truth as an organic whole. Where such a need, instead of being satisfied, was forcibly suppressed, there the one-sided tendency of Gnosticism found its justification." But this is obscure, and Neander's favourite category of reaction is here inapplicable. We look for the solution of the riddle therefore in what follows—"The speculative element in the Gnostic systems is not the product of a reason divorced from history, and resolved to draw everything from its own depths. The void into which a merely negative philosophy invariably sinks had set the human spirit, which ever craves for reality, to seek for a more positive doctrine. In the Gnostic systems we can discover elements of Platonic philosophy, Jewish theology, ancient Oriental theosophy, blended together; but they by no means admit of being explained by the mere mixture and combination of these elements. There is a peculiar living principle which animates most of these

¹ K. G. i. 1, p. 179, sq., 4. N.

² Church Hist. vol. ii. p. 1.

combinations. The time in which they appeared stamped them with a peculiar character. In any age there are certain tendencies and ideas which exert a wonderful influence upon everything contemporary with them. Such, in the present case, was the dualistic principle whose influence harmonised with, and, as it were, reflected the prevailing temper of the age. The underlying tone in many of the more earnest spirits of this time was a consciousness of the power of evil; and Christianity operated in a peculiar way upon this feeling." According to this, the origin and nature of Gnosticism are to be explained by the influence of the dualistic principle. Now, unquestionably dualism is an essential feature of the character of the Gnostic systems. But it cannot suffice to explain the nature of Gnosticism; for the influence of this principle is not seen till it becomes apparent in Gnosticism itself. Neander's most pertinent contribution to the understanding of Gnosticism comes to this: "Gnosticism sought to make the doctrine of religion dependent on a speculative solution of all those questions which speculation had been vainly labouring to solve. In this way it was to lay for doctrine a firm foundation, and to provide for the correct understanding of it; so that this was to be the way in which men were to arrive at an understanding of Christianity, and attain to a true conviction, independent of anything external. In a word, then, Gnosticism was a philosophy of religion; but in what sense was it this?"¹

The name of Gnosticism—Gnosis—does not belong exclusively to the group of phenomena with whose historical explanation we are here concerned. Gnosis is a general idea; it is only as defined in one particular manner that it signifies Christian Gnosticism in

¹ Cf. on the notion of Gnosticism my Inaugural Dissertation *de Gnosticorum christianismo ideali*, Tüb. 1827; and my work *die Christliche Gnosis oder die christliche Religionsphilosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Tüb. 1835. Also my *Essays: Kritische Studien über den Begriff der Gnosis*, Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1837, iii. p. 511, *sq.* Ueber den Begriff der christlichen Religionsphilosophie ihren Ursprung und ihre ersten Formen; *Zeitschr. für speculative Theol.*, edited by Lic. Bruno Bauer, ii. 2, Berlin, 1837, p. 354, *sq.* Also my *Lehrb. d. christlichen Dogmengeschichte*, 2d ed., Tüb. 1858, p. 69, *sq.*; and "Die Tübinger Schule," p. 50, *sq.*

a special sense. Gnosis is higher knowledge, knowledge that has a clear perception of the foundations on which it rests, and the manner in which its structure has been built up; a knowledge that is completely that which, as knowledge, it is called to be. In this sense it forms the natural antithesis to Pistis, Faith: if it is desired to denote knowledge in its specific difference from faith, no word will mark the distinction more significantly than Gnosis. But we find that, even in this general sense, the knowledge termed Gnosis is a religious knowledge rather than any other; for it is not speculative knowledge in general, but only such as is concerned with religion. Thus the apostle Paul uses the word *γνώσις* to characterise that view of the eating of meat offered to idols, which claimed acceptance as more liberal than any other, as more enlightened, more strictly in accord with the essence of the matter in question. In 1 Cor. xii. 8 he speaks of a *λόγος γνώσεως* which, moreover, he distinguishes from the *λόγος σοφίας*.

The distinction must lie in the greater depth of thought put forward in the former style of address. It is especially noteworthy for our purpose that we find the word *γνώσις*, in its more particular sense, used of such religious knowledge as rests on allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures.¹ Gnosis and allegory are essentially allied conceptions; and this affords us a very marked indication of the path which will really lead us to the origin of Gnosticism; for we shall find that allegory plays an important part in most of its systems, especially in those which exhibit its original form.

It is well known that allegory is the soul of the Alexandrian religious philosophy. Nothing else, indeed, can enable us to understand the rise of the latter; so closely is allegory interwoven with its very nature. Allegory is in general the mediator between philosophy and the religion which rests upon positive tradition. Wherever it is seen on a large scale, we notice that philosophical views have arisen side by side with, and independently of, the existing religion; and that the need has arisen to bring the ideas and doctrines of philosophy into harmony with the contents of the religious belief.

¹ Cf. die christliche Gnosis, p. 85, sq.

In such circumstances allegory appears in the character of mediator. It brings about the desired conformity by simply interpreting the belief in the sense of the philosophy. Religious ideas and narratives are thus clothed with a figurative sense which is entirely different from their literal meaning. It was thus that allegory arose before the Christian time among the Greeks. The desire was felt first by Plato, and afterwards still more strongly by the Stoics, to turn the myths of the popular religion to account on behalf of their philosophical ideas, and so to bridge over the gulf between the philosophical and the popular mind; and with this view they struck out the path of allegory, of allegorical interpretation of the myths. It is well known what extensive use the Stoics made of allegory when they wished to trace their own ideas of the philosophy of nature in the gods of the popular belief and the narratives concerning them.¹ But in Alexandria this mode of interpretation assumed still greater importance. Here it had to solve the weighty problem how the new ideas that had forced their way into the mind and consciousness of the Jew, were to be reconciled with his belief in the authority of his sacred religious books. Allegory alone made it possible to him, on the one hand, to admire the philosophy of the Greeks, and in particular of Plato, and to make its ideas his own; and, on the other, to reverence the Scriptures of the Old Testament as the one source of divinely revealed truth. The sacred books needed but to be explained allegorically, and then all that was wished for, even the boldest speculative ideas of the Greek mind, could be found in the books themselves. How widely this method was practised in Alexandria may be judged from the writings of Philo, in which we see the most extensive use made of allegorical interpretation, and find the contents of the Old Testament blended intimately with everything that the systems of Greek philosophy could offer. But it would be quite erroneous to think that it was nothing but caprice and the unchecked play of fancy that called forth this allegorical explanation of the Scriptures, which came to exercise such influence. For the Alexandrian

¹ Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. p. 123, *sq.*

Jew at the stage of spiritual development which he had now reached, with his consciousness divided between his ancestral Hebraism and modern Hellenism, this allegorising was a necessary form of consciousness; and so little did he dream that the artificial link by which he bound together such diverse elements was a thing he had himself created, that all the truth which he accepted in the systems of Greek philosophy seemed to him to be nothing but an emanation from the Old Testament revelation.

Now the Gnostic systems also, for the most part, make very free use of the allegorical method of interpretation; and this is enough to apprise us that we must regard them under the same aspect as the Alexandrian religious philosophy. As far as we are acquainted with the writings of the Gnostics we see them to have been full of allegorical interpretations, not indeed referring, as with Philo, to the books of the Old Testament (for their attitude towards the Old Testament was entirely different from his); but to those of the New, which were for the Gnostics what the books of the Old Testament were for Philo. In order to give their own ideas a Christian stamp, they applied the allegorical method, as much as possible, to the persons and events of the Gospel history, and especially to the numbers that occur in it. Thus for the Valentinians the number thirty in the New Testament, especially in the life of Jesus, was made to signify the number of their Aeons; the lost wandering sheep was for them their Achamoth; and even utterances of Jesus which contain a perfectly simple religious truth, received from them a sense referring to the doctrines of their system. The lately discovered *Philosophoumena* of the Pseudo-Origen,¹ who undertook the task of refuting all the heresies, show us even more clearly than before what an extensive use the Gnostics made of allegory. They applied it not merely to the books of the Old and New Testaments, but even to the products of Greek literature,—for instance, to the Homeric poems. Their whole mode of view was entirely allego-

¹ *Ὁριγένους φιλοσοφούμενα, ἡ κατὰ πασῶν αἵρέσεων ἐλεγχος.* E codice Parisino nunc primum edidit Emmanuel Miller. Oxonii, 1851.

rical. The whole field of ancient mythology, astronomy, and physics was laid under contribution to support their views. They thought that the ideas that were the highest objects of their thought and knowledge were to be found expressed everywhere.¹

The allegorical mode of thought may be described as being simply the means by which a matter composed of various elements receives a form not unsuitable for itself—a form which makes it easily approachable from a side with which it would naturally have least in common. In trying to understand Gnosticism, then, we have first to ask what is the inner nature of that matter for which allegory provides no more than the outward form of expression. In this respect too, Gnosticism stands in a relation of the closest affinity to the Alexandrian religious philosophy, and must be pronounced to be essentially a mere continuation and development of the latter. Both derived their principal contents from Greek philosophy. The system of Philo may be called a speculative system of religion; and the character of the Gnostic systems is closely similar. Such was indeed the light in which the early doctors of the Church regarded Gnosticism. They declared it to be a different thing from Christianity, to be a purely worldly wisdom, and (for instance Tertullian) reproached philosophy with being the author

¹ Cf. the Philos. v. 8. p. 106. *Τούτοις καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις ἐπόμενοι οἱ θαυμασιώτατοι Γνωστικοὶ, ἐφευρετὰ κενῆς τέχνης γραμματικῆς, τὸν ἐαυτῶν προφήτην "Ὁμηρον ταῦτα προφαίνοντα ἄρρητως δοξάζουσι καὶ τοὺς ἀμύητους τὰς ἀγίας γραφὰς εἰς τοιαύτας ἐννοίας συνάγοντες ἐνυβρίζουσι* iv. 46, p. 81. *"Ἰνα δὲ σαφέστερα τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσι τὰ ρηθισόμενα φανῇ, δοκεῖ καὶ τὰ τῷ Ἀράτῳ πεφροντισμένα περὶ τῆς κατὰ τῶν οὐρανίων ἀστρον διαθέσεως ἐξειπεῖν, ὥς τινες εἰς τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν Γραφῶν εἰρημένα ἀπεικονίζοντες αὐτὰ ἀλληγοροῦσι, μετὰ (leg. ἀπατᾶν οἱ πλανᾶν) τὸν νοῦν τῶν προσεχόντων πειρώμενοι, πιθανοῖς λόγοις προσάγοντες αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἃ βούλονται, ξενὸν θαῦμα ἐνδεικνύμενοι ὡς κατηστερισμένων τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῶν λεγομένων:* at v. 20, p. 143, it is said of the Sethiani: *ἔστι δὲ ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν συγκείμενος ἐκ φυσικῶν καὶ πρὸς ἕτερα εἰρημένων ῥημάτων, ἃ εἰς τὸν αἰδίων λόγον μεταγόντες διηγούνται,* p. 144. *"Ἐστι δὲ αὐτοῖς ἡ πᾶσα διδασκαλία τοῦ λόγου ὑπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν θεολόγων, Μουσαίου καὶ Δίνου, καὶ τοῦ τὰς τελετῶν καὶ τὰ μυστήρια καταδείξαντος Ὁρφέως.* Of the Gnostic sect of the Peratai it is said v. 13, p. 127, that they *ἐπιψευδόμενοι τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας ὀνόματι ὡς Χριστοῦ λόγον κατήγγειλαν αἰῶνων στάσιν καὶ ἀποστασίας ἀγαθῶν δυνάμεων εἰς κακά, etc.* The whole of the fancies of astrologers about the stars are interpreted by them in their own sense, and from this it may be seen that their λόγοι τῶν ἀστρολόγων ὁμολογουμένως εἰσιν οὐ Χριστοῦ.

of the heresies.¹ Nor did they derive Gnosticism merely from philosophy in general; they sought also to prove in detail from what philosophical systems the Gnostics had borrowed the main ideas and principles of their own. Irenaeus and Tertullian opened up this line of argument, but it was the author of the *Philosophoumena* who gave the most thoroughgoing demonstration of it. This is the design of his whole work. The refutation of the Gnostic heresies which the author proposes to give, consists merely in showing that one Gnostic writer followed one Greek philosopher, and another another; *e.g.* Simon Magus followed Heraclitus the Obscure, Valentinus Pythagoras and Plato, Basilides Aristotle, Marcion Empedocles. With a view to as accurate as possible a demonstration of this agreement, the author of the *Philosophoumena* sets forth the doctrines of the Greek philosophers in order from Thales downwards. His demonstration is not very convincing, since he deals chiefly with detached points of agreement and with external analogies; but on the whole, he lays before us enough to confirm the general view, that the basis of Gnosticism was the philosophical thought of antiquity: that this was transplanted by Gnosticism into Christianity, with which it was then blended into a system consisting of various elements, but resting on one and the same conception of the universe. In its form and contents Christian Gnosticism is the

¹ De praescr. haer. c. 7. Hae sunt doctrinae hominum et daemoniorum, prurientibus auribus natae de ingenio sapientiae secularis, quam Dominus stultitiam vocans stulta mundi in confusionem etiam philosophiae ipsius elegit. Ea est enim materia sapientiae secularis, temeraria interpret divinae naturae et dispositionis. Ipsae denique haereses a philosophia subornantur. Inde aeones et formae nescio quae infinitae, et trinitas hominis apud Valentinum: Platonius fuerat: inde Marcionis Deus melior a tranquillitate; a Stoicis venerat; et uti anima interior dicatur, ab Epicureis observatur; et ut carnis restitutio negetur, de una omnium philosophorum schola sumitur; et ubi materia cum Deo aequatur Zenonis disciplina est, et ubi aliquid de igneo Deo allegatur, Heraclitus intervenit. Eadem materia apud haereticos et philosophos volutatur, iidem retractatus implicantur: unde malum et quare, et unde homo et quomodo? et quod proxime Valentinus proposuit, unde Dens? scilicet de enthymesi et ectomate. Miserum Aristotelem! qui illis dialecticam instituit, artificem struendi et destruendi, versi pellem in sententiis, coactam in conjecturis, duram in argumentis, operariam contentionum, molestam etiam sibi ipsi, omnia retractantem, ne quid omnino tractaverit.

expansion and development of Alexandrian religious philosophy; which was itself an offshoot of Greek philosophy. But if we are to gain a more accurate notion of what Gnosticism was, we must analyse its main ingredients, and ask with regard to each of its characteristic conceptions whether it belongs to pagan or to Christian thought.

The fundamental character of Gnosticism in all its forms is dualistic. It is its sharply-defined, all-pervading dualism that, more than anything else, marks it directly for an offspring of paganism. Pagan antiquity never got past the antithesis of spirit and matter, and was unable to conceive a world produced by the free creative activity of a purely personal will. In the same way in Gnosticism the two principles, spirit and matter, form the great and general antithesis, within the bounds of which the systems move with all that they contain. Now these two principles cannot merely confront each other in an abstract antithesis. Accordingly the main substance of the systems is the process of world-development which is brought about by the action of the principles upon each other. The world is constituted by, and is the sum-total of the relative and restricted antitheses which proceed from the limitation of the absolute antithesis. The fixed path which everything is to pursue in the world is determined on this side or on that according as the shifting balance dips on the one side or the other of the universal antithesis. The activity which initiates this process comes either from the one side or the other. If from matter, matter in its self-originated activity is the principle of evil, and the process of the world-development therefore takes the form of a continuous antagonism, in which two hostile powers act and react on one another. For matter, as the kingdom of darkness, has a natural instinct of enmity to the principle of light. But if the first impulse of the world-development is on the side of the spiritual principle, then this impulse also must be of a spiritual kind. The moving principle is then the process of the spirit with itself: the natural tendency of spirit is to differentiate itself from itself, and in the differentiation of the several momenta

which are posited by the thinking activity, to become self-conscious spirit—spirit reflected into itself. From this highest height in the purely spiritual process, the world-development goes forward to the sphere of physical and material life. Matter is itself but the limit of the spiritual being, spirit become objective and external to itself. The conception of matter is thus a very negative one; but the dualistic mode of thought does not fail to maintain here also the absolute antithesis of its two principles; the principle of matter is posited in the very impulse of the spirit to go forth from itself and objectivate itself; the principle of matter lies in the tendency from above downwards of the spirit materialising itself, a tendency which admits of no ulterior explanation. Again, it is an equally essential attribute of the spiritual principle, that spirit frees itself again from the dominion that matter has obtained over it, and rises absolutely victorious over every limitation and obscuration that matter can make it suffer. Thus the whole course of the world-development ends only with the return of spirit into itself as pure spirit. Yet the absolute antithesis of the two principles is not at an end even here. The same process of world-development may at once begin afresh, and again follow the same course. The principle of matter can never be so completely removed, the opposing principles can never be so abstractly conceived, that the possibility or necessity should cease to exist for spirit to be drawn again, in an endless series of worlds, into the same process of world-development. Matter cannot raise itself to spirit, but spirit can always externalise itself into matter, and sink down into matter; and accordingly it is by the emanations and projections (*προβολαί*) of the spirit that the infinite abyss between spirit and matter is filled up and the transition from spirit to matter provided for as far as may be. Thus in most of the Gnostic systems an important position is occupied by the Aeons, as the forms of the spirit objectivating itself. In fact it is this conception, that of the Aeons, more than anything else, that identifies these systems with the ancient mode of thought. The Aeons are but the personified ideas, the archetypes of the finite world: in them we are presented with that antithesis of the ideal and the real, or of the upper and the lower

world, which also enters into the very substance of the Gnostic systems.

A further leading Gnostic conception is the Demiurgus. The two highest principles being spirit and matter, and the true conception of a creation of the world being thus excluded, it follows in the Gnostic systems, and is a characteristic feature of them, that they separate the creator of the world from the supreme God, and give him a position subordinate to the latter. He is therefore rather the artificer than the creator of the world. But where did the Gnostics get their notion of a Demiurgus? From the fact that he is identified with the God of Judaism, we might be led to think that he simply came from Judaism into their systems, and that the notion was one which belonged only to the standpoint of the Jewish religion. But Platonism also had its Demiurgus, who held the same position as the Demiurgus of Gnosticism.¹ On the one hand indeed the Platonic Demiurgus stands above the *θεοὶ θεῶν*, the gods of the mythical nature-religion, as the one God and the father of works, which have been made by him, and will not be destroyed as long as he so wills it. But, on the other hand, there is a higher principle above him. The Platonic God can only accomplish his creative work by looking to that which ever remains the same with itself, the ideas, and by taking them for his archetypes, and he must be said to be dependent on the ideas. Now since the Demiurgus holds with Plato the same subordinate position as with the Gnostics, the conception must be fundamentally the same in each case. The Platonic Demiurgus is a mythical form. With Plato the mythical contains an element of truth, in so much as mythus is a necessary form for the setting forth of the abstract philosophical idea; and so the Demiurgus is a mythical personification of the creative power of the ideas. This personification is the form by which alone the mythical view is adjusted to the philosophical consciousness. In the Platonic Demiurgus mythical polytheism passes into a kind of monotheism, the highest truth of which is simply this, that the place of the indeterminate Many is taken by the simple One. This unity on the one hand stands to

¹ See my Essay in the Stud. u. Krit., referred to, p. 187.

express the absolute idea, but the mythical element still asserts itself in the assumption that the creator of the world is a personal being free to act, and of the same nature as the gods of the popular mythical belief. We must regard the Gnostic Demiurgus in the same light. When it is said that Gnosticism derived the substance of its thought from Greek philosophy, this is only one side of the matter; the other is that the form in which it sets forth that thought is a reflection of the mythical mode of view of the Greek popular religion. Not only Greek philosophy, but Greek mythology as well, is an essential ingredient of Gnosticism. All the beings that compose the world of Aeons, and present the idea of the absolute in its various relations, are mythical forms. The only distinction between them and the Demiurgus is that the latter stands at a lower stage, and therefore appears in a more concrete mythical form. He reflects and represents the popular mythical consciousness of God. The immediate reason why the Gnostics identified the Demiurgus with the God of Judaism was, that the God of the Old Testament is described for the most part as the Creator and Lord of the world; but the identification serves to indicate to us the view the Gnostics took of the Old Testament religion. They assigned it to a stage of development at which the religious consciousness had not yet risen above an idea so full of sensuous elements as that of the Demiurgus. The Demiurgus proves more than anything else that the contents of Gnosticism were religion rather than philosophy. The distinction between religion and philosophy is, that in religion the philosophical idea, originally abstract, is presented in a more concrete and material form. Now Gnosticism measures the rank which is due to such ideas in proportion to their sensuousness, and reduces them to a lower rank according as they are more material in their character. It thus places its own thinking consciousness above the sphere occupied by the mythico-religious way of thinking, and so is neither purely philosophy, nor purely religion, but both together. The relation in which it places its two elements, philosophy and religion, towards each other, is such that the only way in which we can describe its general character is to call it a religious philosophy.

The Gnostic Demiurgus exemplifies the principle that the relation of religion to philosophy varies according as the two are conceived as more or less identical in form and in substance. When, as we see in Platonism, the Demiurgus is closely united with the absolute idea of God, the mythical personality appears as a necessary form of presentation, inseparably bound up with the matter presented. When, on the other hand, as in the Gnostic systems, the Demiurgus is placed far beneath the absolute God, and sharply distinguished from him, this is a distinct indication that philosophical reflection feels herself to be superior to the concreteness and materiality of the religious mode of presentation, and able to discard it. Gnosticism fixed the relation of all these notions, standpoints, and antitheses to each other, by laying down not merely two, but three principles, and by regarding the psychical, which stands between the spiritual and the material, as the peculiar field of the Demiurgus. These three principles are the elements of all natural and spiritual being: in particular, they divide men into three essentially different classes. If a union of the two principles, spirit and matter, is possible at all, it can only be effected by the mediation of such a form as the psychical coming in between them. The psychical is thus, no doubt, a third principle; but since there are ultimately only two principles, and the true substance of the psychical is the spiritual which it contains, it follows from the constitution of the psychical that it is at last dissolved into the spiritual. It is the finite, the transitory: the whole world of the Demiurgus must come to an end again at last. The distinction between the spiritual and the psychical, into which the distinction between philosophy and religion may also be analysed, rests ultimately therefore on the broad fact that there are different aspects from which our contemplation may set out, so that a matter identical in itself may yet come to appear in various forms.

What the Demiurgus is on the one side of the Gnostic systems, in their direction downwards, Christ is on their other side, in the direction upwards. There being a descent, there must be an ascent as well, and we recognise the Christian character of these systems

not only in the fact that they assign this definite place to Christ, but also in the great emphasis with which this side is insisted on. The turning-point of the system as it moves through its various momenta is found in Christ. All that serves in any way to adjust the relations of one part with another, to maintain the connection of the whole, to reunite what has been severed, to bring back what has wandered, to open up the road from the lower to the upper world, to bring everything to the point where the consummation and completion of the whole world's course is arrived at—all this is connected with the names Christ and Jesus, and with the conceptions allied to them. In them is contained the goal towards which the whole world-development is pressing. What was originally only a redemption in a moral and religious sense, becomes in the Gnostic systems the restitution and fulfilment of the whole world-order. Even in the world of Aeons Christ restores the broken harmony, and acts as a maintaining, stabilising, uniting principle; and in the lower world, Jesus who was born of Mary, the Soter in this peculiar sense, has the similar task of *διόρθωσις* or *ἐπανόρθωσις*, as the Gnostics term their notion of redemption.¹

Christ is rather a universal cosmical principle than a principle of salvation. On the one side, where the object to be contemplated and comprehended is the procession of the finite from the absolute, the system contained in the Gnostic view of the world takes a direction from above downwards, and descends deeper and deeper, till at last it reaches the point where the general reaction must needs ensue. Christianity comprehends in itself all that lies on the other and opposite side, in the direction from below upwards. We may see, indeed, that even before the Gnostic time the doctrine of Paul contained the suggestions and germs of such a conception of Christianity. With him, Adam and Christ are placed at the head of the two great periods of the world, and stand over against each other as the two principles of the psychical and the spiritual, of death and life. Through Christ, as the conqueror over sin, death, and hell, all is at last subjected to God, so that at last God

¹ *Philos.* vi. 19, p. 175, vi. 32, p. 190; 36, p. 195, *sq.*

is all in all. Still more closely allied to Gnosticism is the Christology which attains such a high and universal range of view in the two Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians; though there can be no doubt that this view is partly owing to the influence of Gnosticism itself. But only in the Gnostic systems is Christ placed in such a connection that his manifestation and activity, or Christianity in general, can only be correctly understood in the light of the great process through which the development of the world pursues its appointed course as it is conditioned from the beginning to the end by the conflict of the opposing principles.

Before we can go further in working out the essence of Gnosticism, we must briefly survey its various sects, forms, and systems, in their historical order.

The earliest known Christian Gnostic is the Jewish Christian Cerinthus. From the new source of our knowledge of the Gnostic doctrines,¹ as well as from those previously known, we learn that what may be regarded as the characteristic mark of Gnosticism was a feature of Cerinthus' teaching, *i.e.* that he distinguished between the two notions of God and of the Creator of the world. He is said to have taught that the world did not come into existence through the First Being, but through a power separate from the universal principle, and not knowing the God who is exalted above all. The Christian element in his Gnosticism appears in the assertion, that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary by natural generation, and differed from other men only in his greater wisdom and righteousness; that after his baptism Christ, the son of the most high God, descended upon him in the form of a dove; that he proclaimed the unknown Father;² but that at last Christ left him again, and that while Jesus suffered and rose again, Christ remained free from suffering.

According to the Fathers of the Church, Simon Magus was the first Gnostic, the forefather of all the Gnostic sects. The groundlessness of this assertion is abundantly clear. If Simon was the originator of all the doctrines which the Fathers ascribe to him, we

¹ Philos. vii. 33, p. 256, *sq.* Comp. Irenaeus, i. 25.

² The words in Philos., p. 257, are τὸν γνῶστον πατέρα; but according to Irenaeus, *loc. cit.*, we have to read ἄγνωστον.

should have to date the rise of Gnosticism at a time when according to all historical indications it was still in the far future. As forefather of the Gnostics, the Simon Magus of the Fathers is an entirely apocryphal and mythical figure, and can only be regarded as a personification of Gnosticism. His assertion that he himself is the most high God shows him to be nothing more than a figure devised to represent the Gnostic idea of the primal Being, of which indeed he is a personification. But the fundamental idea which is meant to be mythically symbolised in him and his companion Helena is the Gnostic idea of syzygy. While seeking to conceive the primal Being according to the absolute notion of him, and as abstractly as possible, the Gnostics were compelled to assume the existence in that Being of a differentiating principle; else it would have been impossible to comprehend how the finite could arise out of the absolute. Accordingly, in their mythical way of looking at things, they represented the highest Being as at once male and female. According to the author of the *Philosophoumena*, Simon expressed himself with regard to his highest principle in the following way:¹—From the one root, which is power, stillness, invisible, incomprehensible, proceeded the two branches, which have neither beginning nor end, of the whole of the Aeons. The one branch, which is visible from above, is the great power, the understanding of the whole, pervading all, and male. The other from below, is the great *ἐπίνοια*, female, giving birth to all. The two come together and form a syzygy, and bring into appear-

¹ In the *Ἀπόφασις μεγάλη* ascribed to him the words *ἀπόφασις μεγάλη* are no doubt to be explained by the sense in which he claimed to be the *δύναμις μεγάλη*. *Ἀπόφασις* means denial. The great denial is undoubtedly nothing else than the Gnostic process which, moving through affirmation and denial, between above and below, between unity and duality, removes and receives back into itself the forms which have arisen through emanation and projection, and been set forth into the world of outward presentation. The process is characterised in this way in the passages contained in the following note. That Simon Magus is represented as the composer of such a work as the *Ἀπόφασις*, is but another aspect of the character given to him of an ideal representative of what were thought to be the peculiarities of Gnosticism. And if Simon Magus never really existed, neither were there ever any real Simonians. Those who were called so were simply those who made use of the works supposed to have been written by Simon Magus. Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Apostol. Väter*, p. 242, sq.

ance the middle space, the infinite air, which has neither beginning nor end. In this is the Father, who sustains and nourishes all that has beginning and end. He is the *Ἐστὼς Στάς, Στησόμενος*. The original principle is an *ἀρσενόθηλος δύναμις*, because, as the highest *δύναμις*, it contains in itself also the *ἐπίνοια*. Thus it is not a simple unity, but such a unity as is at the same time a duality. But the duality does not extinguish the unity, since, though a duality, it is yet but the one principle identical with itself.¹ Since the primal Being is conceived as a spiritual principle, the differentiating principle which it contains is spiritual also: it is the presentative spiritual activity which lives and works in all things seen and imagined in the finite material world. This *ἐπίνοια*, as the presentative consciousness and as the world of presentation, is mythically personified in Simon's companion Helena: according to the custom of the Gnostics to borrow from Greek mythology the symbolical forms in which their own speculative ideas were to be set forth.²

The oldest Gnostic sects are without doubt those whose name is

¹ Philo. vi. 18, p. 173. *Ἔστιν ἀρσενόθηλος δύναμις καὶ ἐπίνοια, ὅθεν ἀλλήλοις ἀντιστοιχοῦσιν, οὐδὲν γὰρ διαφέρει δύναμις ἐπινοίας, ἐν ὄντες. Ἐκ μὲν τῶν ἄνω εὑρίσκεται δύναμις, ἐκ δὲ τῶν κάτω ἐπίνοια. Ἔστω οὖν οὕτως, καὶ τὸ φανέν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐν ὃν δύο εὑρίσκεισθαι, ἀρσενόθηλος ἔχων τὴν θήλειαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ. Οὗτός ἐστι νοῦς ἐπινοία, ἀχώριστα ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, ἐν ὄντες, δύο εὑρίσκονται. Cf. p. 171: Αὕτη, φησιν, ἐστὶ δύναμις μία, διηρημένη ἄνω, κάτω, αὐτὴν γεννώσα, αὐτὴν αὔξουσα, αὐτὴν ζητοῦσα, αὐτὴν εὑρίσκουσα, αὐτῆς μήτηρ οὖσα, αὐτῆς πατήρ, αὐτῆς ἀδελφή, αὐτῆς σύζυγος, αὐτῆς θυγατήρ, αὐτῆς υἱός, μήτηρ, πατήρ, ἐν οὖσα ρίζα τῶν ὄλων. "He that stands triply" is meant to set forth the three stages of the primal being, which is self-existent, proceeds out of itself and is received back into itself. He is, as we read, *loc. cit.*, the *ἐστὼς ἄνω ἐν τῇ ἀγεννήτῳ δυνάμει*, the *στάς κάτω ἐν τῇ ῥοῇ τῶν ὑδάτων ἐν εἰκόνι γεννηθεὶς*, the *στησόμενος ἄνω, παρὰ τὴν μακαρίαν ἀπέραντον δύναμιν ἐὰν ἐξεικονισθῇ* (when he has objectified himself in a real image, and thus externalised himself, he returns back into the unity of the principle).*

² In the Philo., vi. 19, it is said of Simon that he *οὐ μόνον τὰ Μωσέως κακοτεχνήσας εἰς ὃ ἐβούλετο μεθρημηνευσεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τῶν ποιητῶν*. In this feature also Simon fitly represents the character of Gnosticism, its way of bringing everything into its service by means of allegorical interpretation. Cf. *Die christliche Gnosis*, p. 305, sq. In the following passage of the Philo., vi. 18, p. 175, the two figures, Simon and Helena (whose beauty was the occasion of the Trojan war, all the powers of the world wishing to share her *ἐπίνοια*), are made to furnish a very characteristic expression of the tendency of Gnosticism to decompose everything positive, and dissolve into general ideas and views: *Τὴν Ἑλένην λυτρωσάμενος (Σιμών) οὕτως τοῖς ἀνθρώποις σωτηρίαν παρέσχε διὰ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιγνώσεως. Κακῶς*

not derived from a special founder, but only stand for the general notion of Gnosticism. Such a name is that of the Ophites or Naassenes. The Gnostics are called Ophites, brethren of the Serpent, not after the serpent with which the fathers compared Gnosticism, meaning to indicate the dangerous poison of its doctrine, and to suggest that it was the hydra, which as soon as it lost one head at once put forth another; but because the serpent was the accepted symbol of their lofty knowledge. The serpent first appears at the Fall as the intelligent being which by its dialectic weaves good and evil into each other in such a way that the process of the world's history, worked out as it is from the antagonism of the two principles, at once begins. The first priests and supporters of the dogma were, according to the author of the *Philosophoumena*, the so-called Naassenes—a name derived from the Hebrew name of the serpent. They afterwards called themselves Gnostics, because they asserted that they alone knew the things that are deepest. From this root the one heresy divided into various branches; for though these heretics all taught a like doctrine, their dogmas were various. According to Irenaeus and Epiphanius, their system was worked out through several successive stages, and much resembled the Valentinian.¹ In the *Philosophoumena* their doctrine appears simpler. They defined the primal being, as Simon was said to have done, as both male and female, but called it man and the son of man, or Adamas (Adam), and distinguished in it the three principles; the spiritual, the psychical, and the material. The Gnostic perfection was said to begin with the knowledge of man, and to end with the knowledge of God.² Jesus was

γὰρ διοικούντων τῶν ἀγγέλων τὸν κόσμον, διὰ τὸ φιλαρχεῖν αὐτοὺς, εἰς ἐπανάρθωσιν ἐληλυθέναι αὐτὸν ἔφη μετὰ μορφούμενον καὶ ἐξομοιούμενον ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις ὥς καὶ ἄνθρωπον φαίνεσθαι αὐτὸν μὴ ὄντα ἄνθρωπον, καὶ παθεῖν τε ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ δεδοκῆναι μὴ πεπονθότα, ἀλλὰ φανέντα Ἰουδαίοις μὲν ὡς υἱόν, ἐν δὲ τῇ Σαμαρείᾳ ὡς πατέρα, ἐν δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν ὡς πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Ὑπομένειν δὲ αὐτὸν καλεῖσθαι οἷόν τι ὀνόματι καλεῖν βούλωνται οἱ ἄνθρωποι. Ἐπίγνωσις, Gnostic knowledge, would thus be the knowledge and recognition of the same one religion in all forms of religion, of the same one being in all the spiritual powers of the world.

¹ Cf. *Die christliche Gnosis*, p. 171, 87.

² *Philos.*, v. 6, p. 95. Ἀρχὴ τελειώσεως γνῶσις ἀνθρώπου, θεοῦ δε γνῶσις ἀπηρτισμένη τελειώσις.

the counterpart of the primal man. All that the primal man united in himself, the spiritual, the psychical, and the material, descended at once, they affirmed, upon the one man, Jesus the son of Mary. Similar to these are the Perates, of whom hitherto little has been known. It is only the author of the *Philosophoumena* who has contributed to the history of these heretics a clear account of the doctrine of this sect.¹ They assumed three principles: the first is the unbegotten good, the second the self-begotten good, the third the begotten. Everything is triply divided, and Christ sums up in himself all tripartitions. From the two upper worlds, the unbegotten and the self-begotten, the seeds of all possible powers descended into this world in which we are. From the unbegotten realm, from above, Christ came, to save by his descent all that is triply divided. All that has fallen to the lower from the upper sphere will return through him. The third world is doomed to destruction, but the two upper worlds are imperishable. *Euphrates* the Peratic, and *Celbes* the Carystian, are named as the founders of the Peratic heresy; but the name seems rather to point to the assertion of the Peratics, that since they alone knew the necessary law of that which has come into existence, and the way by which man entered into the world, none but themselves were able to overcome decay.² They placed the principle of decay in water. This, they said, is the death that fell upon the Egyptians in the Red Sea. Now, all that are without knowledge are Egyptians: therefore we should leave Egypt, *i.e.* the body. Regarding the body as an Egypt in little, they required that men should pass through the Red Sea, *i.e.* the water of decay, which is Cronos, and betake themselves to the wilderness; that is, attain to that sphere beyond the temporal world, where all the gods of perdition and the God of salvation meet together. The gods of perdition are the stars of the mutable world, which subject to necessity all that rises into being.

¹ *Philos.*, v. 12, p. 123, sq. The Perates were already known from Theodoret, *Haer.* par. i. 17. But Theodoret in his *Heresiology* only used the summary given in the tenth book of the *Philosophoumena*. This was shown by Volkmar, *Hippolytus und die römischen Zeitgenossen*, 1855, p. 22, sq.; so that all that we know in detail of the doctrine of the Perates is derived from the above-cited passage of the *Philosophoumena*.

² *Philos.*, v. 16, p. 131. διελθεῖν καὶ περᾶσαι τὴν φθοράν.

Moses called them the biting serpents of the desert, which killed those who believed that they had left the Red Sea behind them. To those who were bitten in the desert he showed the true, the perfect serpent, and whoever believed in it was not bitten in the wilderness. No one can save those who go out of the land of Egypt, *i.e.* this body, and the world, but only the perfect serpent. He who puts his trust in it is not destroyed by the serpents of the desert, *i.e.* by the gods of the temporal world. The significance which the serpent has in several passages of the Old Testament, as where it is the sign of salvation in the wilderness, or the wonder-working rod of Moses in Egypt, Exod. iv. 17, and above all, in the history of the Fall,¹ placed it so high in the eyes of the Gnostics, that they beheld in it one of their highest principles. The serpent was the same as the Son was. Between the Father on the one side, and matter on the other, is the Son, the Logos, the serpent, ever moving, now towards the motionless Father, and again towards matter which has motion. Now it turns to the Father, and takes up his powers into itself; now it turns with these powers to matter, and the formless matter receives upon itself the impress of the ideas of the Son, of which the Son has received the impress from the Father. And as the serpent mediates between the Father and matter, in order to bring the powers of the upper world down into the lower, so the serpent or the Son is the sole saving principle which enables these powers to return.² It is thus, in a word, the process of world-development, winding its way dialectically through the antitheses.

The substance of these doctrines, ever concerned with the same problems—unity, duality, trinity of principles, their antitheses, and reconciliation, the descent from the upper world into the lower, and the return from the lower into the upper—is so general, that they may all very well have been in existence long before specific Christian Gnosticism arose, and have received their Christian

¹ Philos., p. 133. ὁ καθολικὸς ὄφης οὗτος ἔστιν ὁ σοφὸς τῆς Εὔας λόγος. It is called Catholic as the universal world-symbol; a usage somewhat resembling that in Exc. ex. scr. Theod. par. 47, where the δημιουργὸς καθολικὸς is the Demiurgus in the higher, the universal sense, in contrast to the special Demiurgi.

² Philos., p. 135, sq.

colouring and modification only afterwards, when they expanded under the allegorical and syncretistic mode of view. This is what we have before us in the doctrines said to be those of the Simonians, the Ophites, the Gnostici, the Perates, the Sethians (this name belongs to this series of sects); and especially in such a description of them as that of the *Philosophoumena*. Here we have Gnosticism in all its fluidity and disconnectedness, attaching itself to whatever it can reach, ever seeking, amid the chequered medley of ancient myths and symbols, a new expression for its general fundamental view.

The Gnosticism of more developed structure, of firmer consistence, and which does not shrink from the widest application of its principles, that Gnosticism in which the Christian element is an essential part of the organic system, and cannot be separated from it, meets us first in those systems which are known to us by the names of their authors. The period on which we now enter is the most important in the history of Gnosticism. It begins in the first part of the second century. The chief names which it contains are those of the three famous heresiarchs, Valentinus, Basilides, and Marcion, whose appearance is placed by all the most approved testimonies in the time of Trajan and Hadrian.¹ Basilides is said to have lived at Alexandria about the year 125; Valentinus to have gone from Alexandria to Rome about the year 140. About the same time Marcion came to Rome from Sinope in Pontus: the period during which he flourished at Rome is placed in the years 140-50.² Even these outward facts, that Alexandria was the native country of

¹ Hegesippus in Eusebius, *Ecl. Hist.* iii. 32. Clem. of Alex.: *Strom.* vii. 17.

² As to the chronological statements respecting Marcion and his appearance at Rome, cf. Volkmar, *die Zeit Justin's des Märtyrers*, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1855, p. 270, sq.: "All the older Fathers, when they speak definitely of the date of Marcion, are perfectly clear that he appeared first in the reign of Antoninus Pius, and at the earliest in the year 135." The *Libellus adv. omnes Haereses*, undoubtedly not by Tertullian, says, cap. 6, upon the alleged cause of Marcion's leaving his country, Pontus, and going to Rome: *Post hunc (Cerdonem) discipulus ipsius emersit Marcion quidam nomine, Ponticus genere, episcopi filius, propter stuprum cujusdam virginis ab ecclesiae communicatione abjectus.* It now seems to me, comp. *Die Christliche Gnosis*, p. 296, that the simplest way of explaining this is to suppose, that the "stuprum virginis" was originally nothing but a figurative way of speaking of his heresy, by which he did violence to the Church, the *παρθένος καθαρὰ καὶ ἀδιάφθορος*, according to the expression of Hegesippus, *Euseb.* iii. 32.

several Gnostics, and that two such great heads of sects as Valentinus and Marcion both travelled to Rome, are very noteworthy for the history of Gnosticism.

The profoundest of these systems is also more accurately known to us than any another. It is that which bears the name of Valentinus; though it would perhaps be more fitly termed the Valentinian system, since it is impossible to determine how much of it is to be ascribed to the master, and how much to his disciples. The idea which governs the whole system is that of mapping out the world of Aeons according to its numbers and categories. The total number of the Aeons is thirty; but they are divided into several leading numbers, an ogdoad, a decad, a dodecad. Two Aeons, however, are always connected together, and form an Aeon-pair—for the idea of syzygy is here also one of the fundamental conceptions on which the system is based. Only in the case of the highest Being the followers of Valentinus seem to have given various answers to the question, whether he should be conceived as associated with a female Aeon. Some wished to conceive the Father as simply alone; others thought it impossible that anything should have proceeded from a male alone, and therefore assigned to the Father of the all, in order that he might become a Father, silence (*Σιγή*) as his *σύζυγος*. This silence, however, is only an expression for the abstract notion of his absolute unity or of his being alone. But as he was averse to solitude, and was all love, and love is not love if there is not an object of love as well, the Father felt in himself the desire to beget and produce what was most beautiful and perfect of all that he had within him. Alone then as he was, he begot Nous and Aletheia, the duad which is the mother of all the Aeons within the pleroma. Nous and Aletheia themselves gave birth to Logos and Zoe, and from these two sprang Anthropos and Ecclesia. In order that the perfect Father might be glorified by a perfect number, Nous and Aletheia produced ten Aeons; but Logos and Zoe could only produce the imperfect number of twelve Aeons. In whatever way the Valentinians conceived the relation of this decad and dodecad, the principal series of their Aeons is certainly formed by the six primal Aeons, Nous and Aletheia, Logos and Zoe,

Anthropos and Ecclesia. The further development of the system turns mainly upon the well-known myth relating to Sophia. Sophia is the twelfth of the dodecad, the youngest of the twenty-eight Aeons, and as the weakest and the last member of the whole series, is a female Aeon. But if she was separated by a wide interval from the primal principle, she was proportionately conscious of her great remoteness; and this produced in her a longing to overleap all the intervening members, and unite herself immediately with the primal being. She therefore sprang back into the depth of the Father, wishing to produce alone and by herself, like the Father, something not less than what he produced. She knew not that only the unbegotten, as the principle of the whole, as the root, the depth, the abyss, is competent to beget alone. Only in the unbegotten does all exist together: in the begotten the female produces the substance, but the male forms the substance which the female produces. So what Sophia produced was only an *ἐκτρομα*, as the Valentinians termed it. Within the pleroma there was ignorance in Sophia, formlessness in her offspring: confusion arose in the pleroma; the whole world of Aeons was in danger of becoming formless and defective, and of finally falling a prey to destruction. All the Aeons fled to the Father, and besought him to comfort Sophia, who was plunged in grief for her offspring.

It is easy to see that the myth aims at explaining the procession of the finite from the absolute. The finite can only derive its origin from the absolute, and yet the finite is inconsistent with the idea of the absolute. Now though, by means of the ideas of syzygy and of begetting, the finite is imported into the absolute itself *ab initio*, still in the Aeon series, in which Aeons are begotten by Aeons, the distinction thus introduced is considered to be one that admits of being reduced again to unity. But at last, if the finite as such is to come into existence, a breach with the absolute must ensue which can no longer be adjusted. Thus in the absolute itself there is a breach, a rent, a division, by which the absoluteness of the absolute is made doubtful. The task now arises, on the one hand, to maintain the notion of the absolute pure and unimpaired, in spite of this breach, and on the other to

disengage and eliminate the finite from it. Here is the point where the specific Christian idea of restitution enters to play its part in the system. The Father, pitying the tears of Sophia, and regarding the prayers of the Aeons, commanded a fresh projection; and the number of thirty Aeons was fulfilled, when Nous and Aletheia produced Christ and the Holy Ghost, in order that the *ἔκτρομα* might be formed and separated, and Sophia be calmed and comforted. Christ separated the formless *ἔκτρομα* from the rest of the Aeons, that the perfect Aeons might not be disturbed by the sight of his formlessness. And that it might cease altogether to be visible to them, the Father caused another Aeon to come into existence, viz., Stauros. He was to be the boundary-mark of the pleroma, to hold together in himself the thirty Aeons, and to be a visible representation of the greatness and perfection of the Father. He is called Horos, because he is the boundary between the *πλήρωμα* and the *ὑστέρημα* which lies without; Partaker (*μετοχεὺς*), because he has part in the *ὑστέρημα*; and Stauros, because he stands firm and unchangeable, so that no part of the *ὑστέρημα* can so much as come into the neighbourhood of the Aeons who are within the pleroma. External to Horos or Stauros was the so-called Ogdoad, Sophia, who dwelt outside the pleroma. Christ, as soon as he had formed her, sprang with the Holy Ghost back into the pleroma to Nous and Aletheia, and peace and unity reigned among the Aeons. Thus harmony was restored within the pleroma. But outside the pleroma the same process continued. There Sophia, separated from him who had formed her but had then forsaken her, lay in great fear. Full of longing, she directed her prayer to him in her sufferings, and Christ and the other Aeons all had pity upon her. In the place of Christ comes now Jesus or the Saviour, who is called the common fruit of all the Aeons of the pleroma. Christ and the other Aeons sent him outside the pleroma as the *σύζυγος* of Sophia who was without, to free her from the pains she suffered in her longing after Christ. He freed her by divesting her of the various affections of which this longing consisted, and out of them he made the Psychological, the kingdom of the Demiurgus. The psychical sub-

stance was conceived as fiery. They also called it The Place, the Hebdomad, the Ancient of Days. The Demiurgus also is of a fiery nature, and the words of Moses, Deut. ix. 3, are applicable to him, "The Lord thy God is a consuming fire." The essence of the Demiurgus is composed of all the elements that distinguish the psychical from the spiritual. He is destitute of intelligent consciousness. Sophia, hovering over him in the Ogdoad, works everything in him, while he knows not what he does, and thinks that he himself of his own power effects the creation of the world; as when he says, "I am God, and beside me is no other." Deut. xxxii. 39. The Demiurgus is the creator of souls; he has given them bodies made from material substance, which is diabolic. The inner man, the psychical, dwells in the material body; and the soul is now alone, now in the company of demons, now in that of the *λόγοι*. The *λόγοι*, falling from above, from the common fruit of the pleroma and Sophia, are scattered like germs over this world. The Jesus who is united with Sophia outside the pleroma, and is really the second Christ after the first, is distinguished by the Valentini-ans from a third Christ, the Jesus born of Mary. As the first Christ restored order to the pleroma, and the second to the Ogdoad of Sophia, so the third is to do the same in the present world. This can only be brought to pass, if Christ, who proceeds not only from the Demiurgus, but also from Sophia, reveals that which was concealed even from the Demiurgus. The Demiurgus had been informed by Sophia that he was not the one God, but that there was a higher above him; the great secret of the Father and the Aeons had not remained unknown to him. But he had kept it hidden, and imparted it to none. Thus the revelation of the mystery does not occur within the sphere of the Demiurgus; but when it was time to take away the veil that lay upon the consciousness of psychical man, and to bring all these mysteries to light, Jesus was born of Mary. Placed in this connection, what can Christianity consist in, but in the communication of that knowledge which the Demiurgus possessed indeed, but only abstractly and for himself, so that it should become a part of the common consciousness of mankind? Through Christianity then

does man first learn that the Demiurgus is not the highest God, that above him stand the world of Aeons, the pleroma, and the eternal Father; only with Christianity accordingly does the consciousness of the absolute awaken. Now this knowledge is nothing else than the advance from the psychical to the spiritual. The reason why the Demiurgus knows nothing of the higher order of the world above him is that he stands at the stage of the psychical, and the psychical cannot comprehend the spiritual. The discovery through Christ of that which is hidden from the Demiurgus, is the progress from the period of the psychical principle to that of the spiritual. A new and higher consciousness dawns upon humanity: humanity becomes aware of a higher world-order, lying beyond the order of the earthly, grows conscious of that which exists before all change, of the absolute, and its relation to the finite. But it was the spiritual itself that first became the psychical. We have therefore to distinguish two opposite sides of the world-development. On the one side, the spiritual goes down into the psychical; on the other, the psychical rises into the spiritual. The psychical is only a stage of transition for the spiritual; the spiritual divests itself of its own nature and becomes psychical, in order to return from the psychical back into itself. The spiritual (*πνευματικός*) principle is the spirit as distinguished from matter; and the series of steps by which the spiritual becomes psychical, and the psychical becomes spiritual, is the process conducted by spirit with itself. Spirit, or God, as essential spirit, goes forth from itself, and in this self-revelation of God the world arises, which, while on the one hand distinct from God, is also on the other essentially one with him. But in whatever way we regard this immanent relation of God and the world, whether as a self-revelation of God or as a world-development, it is a purely spiritual process, arising out of nothing but the essence of spirit. In the Aeons which it sends forth out of itself, spirit produces out of itself and places over against itself its own essence. But since the essence of pure spirit is nothing else than thought and knowledge, the process of its self-revelation can only consist in its becoming conscious of its own essence: the

Aeons of the pleroma are the highest conceptions of spiritual existence and life, the general forms of thought, in which what spirit is essentially, it is for the consciousness determinately and concretely. But with the self-knowledge of spirit, with its self-consciousness as it distinguishes itself from itself, is given not only a principle of differentiation, but also, since God and the world are essentially one, of the materialisation of spirit. For the conceptions which spirit uses in order to reach this consciousness are separate and apart from the absolute principle; and the wider this separation, the more is the spiritual consciousness darkened: spirit divests itself of its own nature; it is no longer clear and transparent to itself; the spiritual sinks down to the psychical, the psychical thickens into the material, and the material is connected at its further extremity with the notion of the demonic and diabolical.¹ But as the psychical belongs in its essence to the

¹The most important point of the whole system is the transition from the spiritual to the psychical, represented in the sufferings of Sophia. Here we have before us the extreme pain and distress of spirit struggling with itself, despairing of itself, when on the point of being compelled to strip itself of its own nature and to become something different from what it is. On this point compare the following passage in the *Philosophoumena*, p. 191:—'Ἐποίησεν οὖν ὡς τηλικούτος αἰὼν καὶ παντὸς τοῦ πληρώματος ἕκγονος (Jesus or the Soter), ἔκστῆναι τὰ πάθη ἀπ' αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὑποστάτας οὐσίας καὶ τὸν μὲν φόβον ψυχικὴν ἐποίησεν ἐπιθυμίαν, τὴν δὲ λύπην ὕλικήν, τὴν δὲ ἀπορίαν δαιμόνων, τὴν δὲ ἐπιστροφήν, καὶ δέξιν καὶ ἰκετείαν ὁδὸν καὶ μετάνοιαν καὶ δύναμιν ψυχικῆς οὐσίας, ἥτις καλεῖται δεξιὰ (cf. Christl. *Gnosis*, 134), ὁ δημιουργὸς, ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου τούτεστιν, ὃ λέγει, φησὶν, ἡ γραφὴ Ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου. Αὐτὴ γὰρ ἀρχὴ τῶν τῆς σοφίας παθῶν. ἐφοβήθη γὰρ, εἴτα ἐλυπήθη, εἴτα ἠπόρησε, καὶ οὕτως ἐπὶ δέξιν καὶ ἰκετείαν κατέφυγεν.

This suffering appears then in four states; from fear arises the psychical, from grief the material, from despair the demonic; and a fourth stage follows, apparently very different from the three others. Spirit can be degraded no lower than the point where it is at last changed into the demonic; and therefore the fourth stage is the point where all turns and sways round. Arrived at the extremity of its self-divestment, spirit goes into itself and collects itself in order to find a way out of this torture. Can the words ὁδὸς, μετάνοια, δύναμις have any other meaning than this in a Gnostic work, *Πίστις Σοφία*, published by Petermann, Berlin, 1851, from a Coptic MS.? Sophia's sufferings and μετάνοια form the chief subject of the first part. Jesus descending again after his ascension, for no other object than to impart to his disciples the whole truth from first to last, plain and undisguised, relates the history of the fall of Sophia. When *Πίστις Σοφία* was in the 13th of the Aeons, the place of all her sisters, the *ἀόρατοι* who are themselves the 24 *προβολαὶ* of the great *ἀόρατος*, then it came to pass at the com-

spiritual, and germs of spiritual life are left everywhere, the spiritual must again pierce through the material obscuration of the spiritual consciousness which takes place at the stage of psychical life : it must throw off the veil that is laid upon it in the world of the Demiurgus. The whole world-development is the continuation of the same spiritual process. There must therefore be a turning-point, at which spirit returns from its self-divestment to itself, and becomes once more clearly conscious of its own essential nature. Such is the Gnostic conception of the Christian revelation. Those who know, in the Gnostic sense, that is to say the spiritual, who as such have also the truly Christian consciousness, mark a new epoch in the general spiritual life, and are the highest stage of the self-revelation of God, and of the world-development. This period of the course of the world begins with the appearance of Christ, and ends at last when through Christ and Sophia, all that is spiritual is received back into the pleroma. Christ in his activity is seen as the principle that re-establishes, that maintains unity with the absolute. He is thus seen at every

mand of the first mystery that she looked up, and saw the light of the *καταπέτασμα* of the *θησαυρός* of light. She longed to go there, but was not able ; and instead of performing the mystery of the 13th Aeon, she directed her hymns to the place on high. For this all the archons of the 12 Aeons hated her ; because she ceased from her mysteries, and wished to be above them. The great *τριδύναμος αὐθάδης* hated her most of all ; he who is the third *τριδύναμος* in the 13th Aeon. He sent forth from himself a great power with a lion's face ; and from his *ὑλη* a multitude of *προβολαὶ ἵλικάι*, which he sent to the lower parts, into chaos, to lie in wait for *Πίστις Σοφία* and take away her strength. When Sophia saw in the depth the light-power that had come from *Αὐθάδης*, thinking that this was the light she had seen on high, she descended, out of desire for this light, into chaos, and was there put to sore pain by the *προβολαὶ ἵλικάι* of *Αὐθάδης*. In her distress she called for help on the light which she had seen at first. She had trusted it from the beginning, and in her unflinching confidence in the power of this light—whence she has the name of *Πίστις Σοφία*—she addressed to it her *μετάνοια*. She bewails her distress and pain in 12 *μετάνοιαι*, and prays for the forgiveness of her sins. The 12 *μετάνοιαι* correspond to the 12 Aeons, in respect of whom she has erred ; and the 12th is followed by a 13th, for the 13th Aeon, the *τόπος δικαιοσύνης*, is the place whence she descended. With the 13th *μετάνοια*, her time is fulfilled, the series of her *θλίψεις* is accomplished : Jesus is sent by the first mystery to help her, and leads her back on high from chaos. Cf. Theol. Jahrb. 1854, p. 1 sq.

stage of the world-development, and in the highest regions of the world of Aeons, in which everything at last comes to rest, and which is arranged from the first with a view to this one great result of the whole. Thus, in the Gnostic view of the world, Christ has quite the significance of an absolute world principle.¹ The Valentinian system affords us a clearer view than any other into the specific character of Gnosticism, its deeper spiritual import, and the inner connection of its view of the world. Nor had any other so large a number of adherents.

The school had many ramifications, and the system was elaborated and developed in various ways by the more eminent disciples and successors of Valentinus, as Secundus, Ptolemaeus, Heracleon, Marcus.²

Among the Gnostics contemporary and connected with Valentinus and his disciples, we may mention the two Syrians, Bardesanes and Saturninus; but the most important and the most independent were Basilides of Egypt and his son Isidorus. Our previous knowledge of his system has been much enlarged and modified by the new source of information discovered in the *Philosophoumena*;³ and we shall therefore do well to give a brief statement of its main features.

¹ In this statement I have been guided chiefly by the new sources of information contained in the *Philos.* vi. 29, *sq.*, p. 184, *sq.* The principal points of the system there appear very distinctly: what is wanting may be easily supplied from the more detailed statement, drawn from other sources, which however agree with this one in all essential points, given in my *Christliche Gnosis*, p. 124, *sq.*

² Colarbasus, whose name has generally been placed along with that of Marcus, must in future be struck out of the series of Gnostics. Volkmar is incontestably right in the result of his dissertation in the *Zeitschrift für Hist. Theol.*, 1855, p. 603, *sq.*, viz., that "The Gnosticism of Colarbasus may be reduced to the Valentinian Gnosticism of Kol-Arbas, the highest tetrad of the thirty Aeons, as elaborated by the followers of Marcus, who appealed to an immediate revelation of this tetrad, or of the mother of secrets, Sige, in the same tetrad." The only remaining question would be, whether, under the word Kol, we should not understand rather קול, "the voice," i.e. sound in contrast to silence, than כול, "all the four, all four together."

³ vii. 19, p. 230, *sq.* Compare: Jacobi, *Basilidis philosophi gnostici sententias*, etc., Berlin, 1852; Bunsen, *Hippolytus und seine Zeit*, Leipzig, 1852, i. 65;

The Gnostics, unable to devise terms sufficient to express the idea of the absolute, find themselves obliged to determine it negatively, as that which is exalted above all expression and conception. Thus Basilides places simple nothing at the summit of his system, and thus speaks of God, not as the Being, but as the not-being. There was simply nothing,—not matter, not substance, not what is without substance, not simple, not compound, not man, not angel, not God, simply nothing of all things that can be perceived or imagined. Still, the not-being God made a not-being world out of the not-being: yet every positive attribute is denied of this making, this act of the divine will.¹ Basilides was of opinion that as, generally, the expressions which we use do not really correspond to the things they signify, this must much more be the case in speaking of the absolute; there every positive and negative statement can be but a sign of what we wish to say. We can see clearly that Basilides' great difficulty was to get a beginning. God is and is not, and so the world is and is not; one cannot tell how it came into being; it simply is. In order to get rid of every idea of an emanation or projection from God,² Basilides conceived the world, as in the Mosaic book of Genesis, as brought into existence simply and only by the word of him who spoke: though sometimes he did not hesitate to speak of the world as a divine *προβολή*. Thus the standpoint of Basilides differs from that of Valentinus, inasmuch as what is principally kept in view in his system is rather the return to God than the going forth from God. A prominent con-

Uhlhorn, das Basilidianische System mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Angaben des Hippolytus, Gött. 1855. Hilgenfeld, Das System des Gnostikers Basilides, Theol. Jahrb. 1856, p. 86, *sq.* Cf. Die jüdische Apokalyptik 1857, p. 287, *sq.* My essay: Das System des Gnostikers Basilides und die neuesten Auffassungen desselben, Theol. Jahrb. 1856, p. 121, *sq.*

¹ Philos. p. 231: Ἀνοήτως, ἀναισθήτως, ἀβούλως, ἀπροαιρέτως, ἀπαθῶς, ἀνεπιθυμήτως, κόσμον ἠθέλησε ποιῆσαι. Τὸ δὲ ἠθέλησε λέγω, φησί, σημασίας χάριν, ἀθελήτως καὶ ἀνοήτως καὶ ἀναισθήτως.

² Philos. p. 232: φεύγει γὰρ πάνν καὶ δέδοικε τὰς κατὰ προβολὴν τῶν γεγονότων οὐσίας ὁ Βασιλεὺς. He compared the process of emanation to the act of a spider spinning its threads out of itself. He took as his beginning the absolute notion of the not-being, thus opposing the idea of emanation, which assumes the entire reality of the being.

ception of his system is the separation of the powers and elements. Since that alone can be separated which was formerly mingled and connected, Basilides assumed that those elements which afterwards came in the course of development to be separated, and to take up more and more independent positions, were originally mixed, or existed in each other or side by side. And thus the *σύγχυσις ἀρχικὴ*, which Clement of Alexandria attributes to him,¹ has always been regarded as characteristic of his system, though it has not been satisfactorily shown how it is to be understood. According to the new source of our knowledge, we are obliged to consider it as one of the postulates of his system, which it was necessary for him to make in order to get a beginning of the development. What he says in the exposition of his system is applicable here. Everything seeks to rise from below upwards, from the bad to the better; but nothing is so senseless as to leave the better and go downwards. Unable to explain how a *σύγχυσις ἀρχικὴ* was brought about, he was yet obliged to presuppose it, if he wished to regard the world-development as a process of separation. He accordingly supposed a *σπέρμα τοῦ κόσμου*, which contains, as in the smallest germ, all that is comprehended in the whole world.²

¹ Cf. Die Christliche Gnosis, p. 211, 87.

² Philos. p. 231. Τὸ δὲ σπέρμα τοῦ κόσμου πάντα εἶχεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ὡς ὁ τοῦ σινάπεως κόκκος ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ συλλαβῶν ἔχει πάσας ὁμοῦ τὰς ρίζας—οὕτως οὐκ ὢν θεὸς ἐποίησε κόσμον οὐκ ὢν (ὄντα) ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, καταβαλλόμενος καὶ ὑποστήσας σπέρμα ἐν ἔχον πᾶσαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου πανσπερμίαν. All was in it, but as yet undeveloped and formless. He therefore calls this πανσπερμία an ἀμορφία, p. 229. The σπέρμα is an οὐκ ὢν, as God is οὐκ ὢν θεός, εἶχε γὰρ πάντα τὰ σπέρματα ἐν ἑαυτῷ τεθησαυρισμένα καὶ κατακείμενα, οἷον οὐκ ὢν, ὑπὸ τε τοῦ οὐκ ὄντος θεοῦ γενέσθαι προβέβουλευμένα, p. 233. The dominant conception of the system is the unity or immanent relation of being and not-being; there is no being that does not include in itself a not-being, and no not-being that does not presuppose a being. This unity, conceived as negatively and abstractedly as possible in the οὐκ ὢν θεός, has developed into a notion of something concrete in the σπέρμα οὐκ ὢν. The relation of God and the world is viewed as the immanent transition from the abstract to the concrete, from the ideality of that which is only conceived to the reality of the actual. The moving principle is the tendency to set forth out of unity the antitheses which, while in unity, are still indifferent, and cause them to confront one another in their pure opposition. This is done when the abstract antithesis of being and not-being becomes the concrete antithesis of spiritual and material.

When this embryo of the world has been once evolved from God as the principle of the world, and not till then, the world-development enters on its determinate course. The divine germs contained in the primal world are called by Basilides the sonship (*υιότης*).¹ This again is distinguished into three separate constituent parts as soon as the first projection of the *σπέρμα* has taken place. The finest part at once returns to the not-being with a swiftness which Basilides characterises by the poetic expression *ὥσεί πετρὸν ἢ νόημα*.² Every nature in fact strives, one in one way, another in another, to reach the not-being, attracted by its exceeding beauty. The denser part strives to follow the finer, but remains in the *σπέρμα*; yet it also clothes itself with wings, after the manner of the soul in Plato. The principle that gives the wings is the Holy Spirit: the relation in which it stands to this part of the *υιότης* is described by saying that the two are as mutually serviceable as the wing and the bird, neither of which can soar upward without the help of the other. The Spirit rises, indeed, and comes near to that finest part of the *υιότης*; but it cannot, from its nature, endure the region of the not-being God and of the *υιότης*, the purest region, exalted above every name. It therefore remains behind; but, as a vessel once filled with sweet-smelling ointment keeps the perfume even when empty, so the Holy Spirit has, as it were, a perfume of the *υιότης*, and this perfume descending from the Holy Spirit penetrates to the formless under-world. After the first and second soaring of the *υιότης*, the Holy Spirit remains in the midst between the world and that which is above the world.³ After these two parts of the being have been separated by a firmament, the great Archon, the head

¹ The *ἐκλογὴ κόσμου* in Clemens Alex. Cf. *Die Christliche Gnosis*, p. 223, sq. The expression *υιότης*, denoting the spiritual, might seem to refer to the higher grade in which the Son stands in this development from below upwards. So the son of the Archon is more intelligent than the Archon himself. But the expression is to be taken in the sense of the phrase *υιοὶ θεοῦ* (Rom. viii. 14, sq.), Philos. p. 238.

² Homer. Od. vii. 36.

³ Hence the *πνεῦμα μεθόριον*. From the same mediating function (*ἐνεργετεῖν*) the Spirit is described in Clemens of Alexandria as *πνεῦμα διακονούμενον*.

of the world, tears himself away from the σπέρμα κοσμικόν (and the πανσπερμία τοῦ σωροῦ), and knowing not that above him there is a wiser, mightier, and better than he, he thinks himself the lord, the sovereign, and the wise architect of the world, and begins to make all the things the world contains. First, not liking to be alone, in imitation of the plan which the not-being God sketched when he laid the foundation of the world in the πανσπερμία, he begot, from the matter of the world which he had ready before him, a son who was far wiser and better than himself. Surprised by his beauty, he set him on his right hand. By his help he made the ethereal world, the kingdom of the great Archon, called by Basilides the Ogdoad. After the completion of this ethereal world, which extended down to the moon, another Archon arose out of the πανσπερμία, who also is greater than all that is under him except the *υἰότης*, which still remains behind. His place is the Hebdomad, and he too has a son who is more understanding and wiser than himself. From these worlds is now distinguished the region which, as the basis of the whole world-development, Basilides called the *σωρὸς* and *πανσπερμία*. It has no governor, arranger, or Demiurgus of its own; but the thought placed in it by the not-being at the creation suffices for it. In it remains the third *υἰότης*, which has also to be revealed, and to be brought up to the region where, beyond the Spirit, are the two first parts of the *υἰότης* and he who is not-being. This is the creature, groaning and waiting for the manifestation of the children of God; and we, says Basilides, are these children, we are the spiritual still remaining behind here. When we, the children of God, for whose sake the creature groaned, were to be revealed, the Gospel came into the world. It did not come by the descent of the blessed *υἰότης* of the inconceivable, blessed, not-being God; but, as naphtha kindles a fire at a great distance, so did the son of the great Archon receive the thoughts of the *υἰότης* by the mediation of the Spirit. The Son learnt that he was not the God of the whole, but that there was over him the Ineffable, the not-being. He went into himself, was affrighted at the ignorance he had been in up to this

time, and how his son sitting beside him—who is now called Christ—instructed him who the not-being is, what the *νιότης* is, what the Holy Spirit, how the universe has been disposed and arranged, and whither it is to return. Basilides also applied to the fear which seized the Archon the words *ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος Κυρίου* (Prov. i. 5); and to the penitence with which he confessed the sin of his self-exaltation, the passage Ps. xxxii. 5. The same instruction was imparted also to the whole Ogdoad, and from the Ogdoad the Gospel then came to the Hebdomad. The son of the great Archon caused the light which he had received from above, from the *νιότης*, to rise on the son of the Archon of the Hebdomad. Thus enlightened, the son announced the Gospel to the Archon of the Hebdomad; and the impression it produced on him was not different from that produced on the Archon of the Ogdoad. After all these regions with their countless *ἀρχαὶ, δυνάμεις*, and *ἐξουσίαι* and the 365 heavens, whose great Archon is Abrasax, had received the enlightenment of the Gospel, the light had to descend also to the *ἀμορφία* in the nethermost world, in which we are; and the hitherto unknown mystery had to be revealed to that *νιότης* which, like an *ἐκτρωμα*, was left in the *ἀμορφία*. Thus the light, which had come from the *νιότης* through the Spirit to the Ogdoad and thence to the Hebdomad, descended to Mary, and her son Jesus was enlightened by it. The power of the highest which overshadowed Mary is the power of the *κρίσις*, the separation. The world must continue till all the *νιότης* left behind for the aid of the souls in the *ἀμορφία* follows Jesus, and returns purified. It becomes so fine, that, like the first *νιότης*, it soars aloft through its own nature. This *κρίσις* and the *ἀποκατάστασις*, which it is to bring about, now come into the foreground of the system.¹ The design of the whole Gospel history from the beginning is to show how Jesus separates and divides all that is mixed without form outside the Ogdoad and the Hebdomad. This separation and

¹ Philo. p. 244. ὅλη γὰρ αὐτῶν ἡ ὑπόθεσις, σύγχυσις οἷον ἐ πανσπερμίας καὶ φυλοκρίνεσι καὶ ἀποκατάστασις τῶν συγκεχυμένων εἰς τὰ οἰκεία. Τῆς οὖν φυλοκρινήσεως ἀπαρχὴ γέγονεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

division takes place with regard to all that is still left behind, in the same way as it had taken place with regard to Jesus himself. His suffering had no other object than the separation of that which was mingled. What suffered in him was the bodily part which he received from the *ἀμορφία*, and this returned to the *ἀμορφία*. In the same way the psychical element which came from the Hebdomad returned to the Hebdomad; what came from the higher region of the great Archon returned to him; and what was of the Spirit remained with the Spirit. But the third and still remaining *υἰότης* soared through all these elements up to the blessed *υἰότης*. Thus all returns to its place; and when it is there, there it is to stay. For whatever stays in its place is imperishable; but that which oversteps its natural bounds is perishable. It was for this reason that, at the epoch at which Christianity revealed that which was hitherto a mystery, a great ignorance came over the whole world, in order that no unnatural desire might anywhere arise. The Archon of the Hebdomad is prevented from knowing what is above him, in order that he may not desire the impossible, and so suffer pain and sorrow. The same ignorance overtakes the great Archon of the Ogdoad. The universal *ἀποκατάστασις*, therefore, consists in this, that everything arrives, at the time determined, at the place where, according to its natural constitution, it ought to be; or in this, that it is recognised as being that which it essentially is.¹

The fundamental idea pervading the system is the same with Basilides as with Valentinus. The spiritual principle divests itself of its own nature, and becomes the psychical and material; and after this self-divestment, it must again be received back into itself. This is the process of world-development which reaches its accomplishment in Christianity. But this accomplishment cannot take place, unless by the spiritual natures attaining a consciousness of their true being; that is, of the spiritual principle which has being essentially, which is absolute and supramundane, with which the

¹ Philos. p. 242. Καὶ οὕτως ἡ ἀποκατάστασις ἔσται πάντων τεθεμελιωμένων μὲν ἐν τῇ σπέρματι τῶν ὄλων ἐν ἀρχῇ, ἀποκατασταμένων δὲ ἐν καιροῖς ἰδίοις.

spiritual natures are essentially one, even in that present state in which they are hidden and obscured by the psychical and the material. It is this consciousness of that which essentially is, and is supramundane, that forms the true essence of Christianity. And so accordingly Basilides defines it.¹ Although that which comes to its accomplishment in Christianity has first been undergoing preparation in the earlier stages through which the process of world-development moves, still it does not attain its full reality, till the absorption of spirit into itself has reached its deepest depth. As Valentinus distinguished three different Christs, so in the system of Basilides Jesus cannot appear till after the two sons of the ruler of the Ogdoad and the ruler of the Hebdomad. These three are essentially one; in all the three we have the same principle, which mediates between the several spiritual beings and the primal principle, maintains and restores their connection with it, and recalls them to unity. Both with Valentinus and with Basilides we find the Holy Spirit placed along with Christ, and subordinate to him in the same capacity. The Sophia of Valentinus coincides with the Christ and the Holy Spirit of Basilides; Sophia herself is not found in the doctrine of the latter, since the more concrete idea of syzygy is altogether absent from his system. The Gospel only declares universally that which, though it existed before, existed as a mystery. Before the Gospel, in proportion as any given time was more remote, the deeper was the concealment of this mystery.² What was at first shrouded in thick darkness, and then, though declared, was yet, as it were, but a glimmering light,

¹ Philos. p. 243. *Εὐαγγέλιόν ἐστι κατ' αὐτοὺς ἡ τῶν ὑπερκοσμίων γνώσις.* Only when one knows what is above the world, can one know also what the world itself is.

² In this sense Basilides said, p. 23S, that the Ogdoad was *ἄρρητος*, the Hebdomad *ῥητόν*, and that the Archon of the Hebdomad said to Moses: "I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the name of the God I did not make known to them" (Ex. vi. 3), i.e. the name of the *ἄρρητος θεός*, the Archon of the Ogdoad. In the period from Adam to Moses, the proper period of the ruler of the Ogdoad *πάντα ἦν φυλασσόμενα ἀποκρύφῳ σιωπῇ*. The two rulers mark two periods of the world.

and was only to break through in the creature which was waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God,—this in Christianity becomes the broad and full daylight of clear and transparent spiritual consciousness. And it is just at this time that God caused a great ignorance to come over the whole world, in order that nothing might strive to overstep the bounds of its nature. The assertion of this ignorance gives us much help towards characterising the standpoint of the system. The ignorance denotes that progress in the march of the world's history, by virtue of which each period is deemed the highest, and regarded as absolute, only so long as spirit in its development has not gone forward to a higher stage. In contrast to a higher stage, the stage preceding appears so subordinate and at so low a level, that all its glory is veiled as by the darkness of ignorance. The two Archons especially are overtaken by this ignorance; but such is the fate also of all that was great and important in its time, and, like the minds of those rulers, believed itself to be the power that governed the world. It is of necessity given over to the darkness of unconsciousness, when the progressing spirit of the world passes beyond it. Therefore, according to Basilides, everything has its determinate limits, its determinate time. Knowledge is ever changing into its contrary. As the process of history is carried further and further, spirit, ever retiring into itself, receives back into itself the forms which it had sent out as of apparently permanent importance. The forms dissolve, and there remains at last, as all that is really before the consciousness, only the abstract notion, the natural law which is immanent in the subsisting order of the world.¹ Here the realism and the idealism of the Gnostic view of the world so interpenetrate one another, that the process exhibited in it is rather the phenomenological process of the spirit than the real one of the world. It is not the real principles of the world's origin in themselves, that are the highest absolute point whence all proceeds, and on which all depends. It is these principles only because

¹ The present order of the world, Basilides says, has no governor, such as the Archons were: ἀρκεῖ ὁ λογισμὸς ἐκείνος, ὃν ὁ οὐκ ὦν, ὅτι ἐποίησεν, ἐλογίζετο.

they are the object about which the consciousness of spirit, knowing and thinking, moves, gaining, as it employs itself with these necessary postulates of its own procedure, a clear perception of itself, and being thus enabled to comprehend the antitheses of the subsisting order of the world in all their width. And this is exactly what the genuine Gnostic conception of ἀποκατάστασις amounts to. The main point is, not that something which is not yet, becomes realised in the world of objective existence; but that something which already exists in essence becomes firmly established. That which already has being essentially is to be made to be for consciousness as well, and to be recognised in the consciousness of knowing subjects as that which it already is in essence.¹ The more completely the objective being of things becomes a subjectively known being, and the stricter and closer, therefore, the unity of being and consciousness, so much the more fully is the goal of the world's development attained. It appears plainly from this, that the highest subject with which the Gnostic systems concern themselves, is ever ultimately knowledge and intuition, Gnosis in its peculiar absolute significance. This is what gives the system of Basilides, in the form in which it is now known to us, its distinguished position in the history of Gnosticism. It affords us a deeper insight than any other system into the inner nature of Gnosticism, and the intellectual process carried on in Gnostic speculation.²

¹ The ἀποκατάστασις is the third of the successive connected stages after the σύγχυσις and φυλοκρίνησις, Philos. p. 244. The Gnostic addresses himself to his highest task when he determines that the all-important question he has to seek to answer is τίς ἐστιν ὁ οὐκ ὢν, τίς ἡ νιότης, τί τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τίς ἡ τῶν ὅλων κατασκευή, πρὸς ταῦτα ἀποκατασταθήσεται, Philos. p. 239. This result is attained when the τῶν ὅλων κατασκευή is known and recognised in the consciousness of knowing subjects as that which it essentially is. In this sense it is ἀποκατάστασις τῶν συγκεχυμένων εἰς τὰ οἰκεία. All that is comes to stand in its due and proper place, when that which is various in itself is known and contemplated without confusion in its variety of principles. In this indeed all knowledge and intuition consist. Ἀγνοία as above defined is an essential step of the ἀποκατάστασις which is thus accomplished.

² Hilgenfeld (in loc. cit.) affirms that the statement of the system of Basilides given in the Philosophoumena is neither fairly consistent with that given by the

We have said that the fundamental character of Gnosticism is its dualistic view of the world. This statement seems at first to receive but slight confirmation from our inquiry into the two systems, which we have described at some length as the two chief representatives of the Gnostic mode of thought. They cannot indeed entirely conceal the dualistic basis on which they are founded; yet this element is not prominent in them, and can scarcely be regarded as their principal distinguishing feature. We should thus be led to say that the peculiar nature of Gnosticism was not fully developed before the appearance of the system of Marcion, which, on account of its more strictly dualistic form, we must distinguish from those hitherto set forth, as marking a new stage of Gnostic thought. Still the distinction is merely relative; for none of the systems, however various their modifications, ever get past the antithesis of spirit and matter. But with regard to this antithesis itself, strict as it seems to be, we nevertheless are able to gather from our inquiries up to this point the very characteristic fact, that the two principles do not form a pure antithesis. The one principle always contains something derived from the other. If spirit is unable to resist its longing to materialise itself, it contains already the principle of matter. And if matter is moved by the impulse to come into contact with spirit, then it has in itself a spiritual element. The two are related as two forces authorities hitherto known to us, nor derived from original knowledge. For disproof of this position, compare my *Abhandlung* quoted above, p. 150, *sq.* What Hilgenfeld has further laid down in the *Anhang zur jüd. Apokal.* p. 287, contains nothing really new. It is clear enough that we are equally unable to determine precisely, in the system of Basilides and in that of Valentinus, how much is due to the founder and how much to the further elaboration of disciples. But, with regard to this question, in a general history of Gnosticism, the form which contains most distinctly the characteristic features of the system is our surest guide. And this form of the Basilidian teaching is undoubtedly to be found in the statement given in the *Philosophoumena*. The doctrine of Basilides seems to have assumed various modifications; his name is connected with Manichaeism (*Das Manich. Rel. Syst.* p. 84) and Priscillianism (*Gieseler, Eccl. Hist.* i. 2, p. 98). It is likely enough that the *σύγχυσις ἀρχικῇ*, as the duality of principles, appeared more unmistakably at the summit of the system in one of these forms than in the others. But this need not prevent us from regarding the statement of the *Philosophoumena* as composed of genuine Basilidian elements.

of one and the same substance, and are both attracted and repelled by each other. In their general character, then, the Gnostic systems may as fitly be called pantheistic as dualistic. The antithesis is in any case the same, and all that the difference amounts to is whether the scale falls on the one side or on the other, or whether an almost exact equilibrium is maintained: as one or the other of these alternatives prevails, the system is more or less dualistic. The least dualistic system of all is that of Valentinus, in which spirit and matter are in fact related as substance and accident; spirit is the being, matter the not-being. The same is the case with Basilides, only that the two terms change places: here the spiritual is called the not-being; the material accordingly is the being. The subordination of spirit to matter is carried by Basilides to the furthest point possible. With him they are so immediately one, that in their unity the antithesis turns into indifference, and therefore the development is not from above downwards, as with Valentinus, but from below upwards. It is with Marcion, however, that we meet with dualism in its most genuine form. Here the two principles are placed at the summit of the system in their pure antithesis, although this form too is but a modification of the same fundamental relation.

It is true that the doctrine on which Marcion laid most stress was the sharp dualistic separation of the Law and the Gospel. But it is with perfect justice that he is placed in the series of the Gnostics, since his view of the Law and the Gospel is based on the general antithesis of the two principles, which determine his view of the world. Not only did he assume a matter co-eternal with the highest God, but he also placed the Creator, whom he as well as his predecessors distinguished from the highest God, in such a relation to him and to matter, that he could only be conceived along with matter, under one and the same fundamental notion.¹ The effect of this stricter dualism, however, was to give Marcion's system an essentially different character from that of the other Gnostics. It has nothing in common with them except the four

¹ Compare *Die Christliche Gnosis*, p. 276, sq.

principles, the highest God, matter, the Demiurgus, and Christ. Marcion has no pleroma, no Aeons, no syzygies, no suffering Sophia. Now in the other systems where they appear these principles serve the purpose of setting in motion and helping forward the general process of world-development till it arrives at the point at which in Christianity that which was already in existence comes to full reality and accomplishment. In Marcion's system, therefore, where these principles are wanting, everything takes place suddenly and abruptly, without preparation, without the interposition of connecting links. Everything is arranged so as to sever the connection between Christianity and what went before it. Paganism, according to him, has no affinity with Christianity under any aspect. Even Judaism stands so far below Christianity, that the relation of the one to the other is in his eyes that of the sharpest antithesis. The Demiurgus is not merely a limited and imperfect being, but one who offers opposition to the highest God and Christ.¹ While with Valentinus and Basilides the Demiurgus humbles himself before Christ and returns into himself, with Marcion it is he who compasses Christ's death. It is true that the chief predicate applied to him is righteousness; but in Marcion's view mercy and righteousness stand so far apart, that the latter is nothing but strictness and hardness. The notion of righteousness indeed is only introduced to mark the difference and antithesis between Christianity and Judaism; and this is but one instance of Marcion's strong and decided view of the entire newness and immediateness of Christianity, its incomprehensibleness, and the absence of preparation for it. The God revealed by Christ is a completely unknown God, of whom men had not even a presentiment before, either in the heathen or in the Jewish world. Hence it results, that the Gnosticism of Marcion is in tendency exactly opposed to that form of Gnosticism of which Valentinus is the chief representative. In all the systems that belong to the earlier form of Gnosticism, the common tendency is to bring as

¹ Philos. vii. 31, p. 254. Κακὸς δ' ἐστὶν, ὡς λέγει, ὁ δημιουργὸς καὶ τούτου τὰ ποιήματα.

many intermediate links as possible between the absolute point of commencement and the point when Christianity appears as a new stage of development. They deliberately apply themselves to the task of giving as vivid and concrete a representation as they can of the whole process of development; and Christianity enters into this process in such a way that its whole being and nature can only be comprehended by means of all that it presupposes. All this is quite otherwise with Marcion. With a completely opposite tendency and aim, he seeks to remove from the sphere which those systems fill with their ideal beings, everything that might be thought to be a preparation for Christianity. Only the pure antithesis is to be preserved. And yet, though the two tendencies seem to be opposed, though it seems to be the essence of the one to connect and join, and of the other to tear and cut away every link of connection, still the distinction can be but relative. Such it must be, if the system of Marcion is to be referred to the category of Gnosticism as well as those of Valentinus and Basilides: they are only various forms and modifications of one and the same mode of view. And this anticipation is confirmed by a closer examination. Suddenly and abruptly as the God revealed by Christ appears, and begins to play his part in the history of the world and religion, yet this is merely the mode of his external appearance and revelation to the consciousness of humanity. Even in this appearance the absolute being of the hitherto unknown God is presupposed. The Demiurgus of Marcion, again, may differ from that of the two other Gnostics; but in Marcion's view too, the God revealed by Christ cannot appear and begin to act until the kingdom of the Demiurgus, as the lord of the pre-Christian period, has gone before. The whole history of the world and religion being thus divided into two periods, one of which necessarily presupposes the other; and this relation being incomprehensible except by means of a principle in which unity is bestowed on the antithesis of Christian and pre-Christian: we find this to be the common element between the tendencies of Marcion and that of the other Gnostics, that they make all that is

of the essence of Christianity, and belongs to the essential Christian consciousness, dependent on its antithesis to prepare and introduce it. It is thus neither dualism alone, nor the Demiurgus alone, that constitutes the essence of Gnosticism, but the relation in which the Demiurgus stands to Christ, viz., such a relation that Christ himself cannot be, unless the Demiurgus be presupposed. Here then Marcion is as good a Gnostic as any other. Again it is to be remembered that the Gnostic Demiurgus himself is only a mythical personification, one more instance of the general habit of the thought of the ancient world to set forth its conceptions in symbols and personifications. Bearing this in mind, we can see that even when seeking most to assert his Christian consciousness and to know nothing of the pre-Christian world, Marcion is still far from escaping from its modes of thought. He too is unable to conceive the pre-Christian in its distinction from the Christian world, except by the aid of such a figure as the Demiurgus. He too holds a standpoint, at which his Christianity is essentially determined by the general antitheses of his theory of the world. Still, there is a characteristic distinction between him and the other Gnostics; but it is only the consequence of the attitude of strong opposition he takes up towards everything pre-Christian. This distinction is, that he is on the point of passing from the transcendental sphere of an objective world-consciousness in which the world-development moves in the antithesis of spirit and matter, or of the spiritual and the psychical, to that of the subjective consciousness, where the course of the world-development is determined with reference to the ethical ideas of the Law and the Gospel, righteousness and mercy, fear and love. The general Gnostic antithesis of spirit and matter is thrown into the back-ground: instead of it, in order to hold the Law and the Gospel apart in the full width of their distinction, Marcion bases his view of the world or his religious consciousness upon the antithesis of the visible and the invisible.

The Gnosticism of Marcion discards the Aeons, and retains the Demiurgus, but on the other hand sharpens the dualistic distinc-

tion. We are led to ask whether there is not a third form of Gnosticism: a form in which the Demiurgus, whose separation from the highest God gives him even with Marcion a heathen aspect, loses prominence, and in which dualism itself is less pronounced; while some at least of the characteristic essence of Gnosticism still remains in this, that Christianity is still regarded from the point of view of the general world-development. Such a system is in fact set forth in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, and we have now to consider it. It is indeed very different from the systems commonly counted under the name of Gnosticism; and it might quite properly be asked, whether it should be placed in the same series at all. Yet on the other hand we find in it a new and peculiar combination of all the Gnostic notions, and can call it nothing else than a fresh form of Gnosticism.

If we considered that the chief criterion of Gnosticism is to be found in the separation of the Creator from the highest God, in the manner in which it is usually understood, then a system which pronounces against this separation so expressly as the pseudo-Clementine cannot be regarded as Gnostic. But while fully recognising this as a criterion, we can still affirm that the system of the Homilies bears a thoroughly Gnostic character. True, there is not only an antignostic sound, but a really antignostic meaning, in the emphatic statement that the fundamental truth of all religion is, that the highest God is also the Creator of the world. It is the same, when the Homilies carry the idea of the inseparableness of these two conceptions so far as to say, that even were the Creator the worst of all beings, all the worship of men would nevertheless be due to him alone, since from him alone does man derive his existence. Here the two ideas of God and Creator are presented to us as simply identical for man's religious consciousness.¹ But in spite of the identity of these two conceptions, we see that the Homilies set up a separation between them again. First of all, according to them, God is not the creator of matter. A creation from nothing is unknown to them; they, like the other Gnostics,

¹ Hom. xviii. 22.

assume an original matter, which is together with God as his co-eternal body, and whence the four elements and primal substances proceed through the spirit of God, which penetrates the body and transmutes it into various forms.¹ Again, even in so far as God is the Creator, he is so not immediately, but only through the mediation of Sophia. Sophia, always united with God as his soul, is the world-creating principle, by which God goes out of himself and the monad becomes the duad. Sophia is, accordingly, expressly called the Demiurgic hand of God.² Thus, the only distinction of the Sophia of the Homilies from that of the Gnostic systems is, that here she is not separated from God, but is placed in the same relation of immanence to his being in which matter also stands to him. A point which contributes still more to establish the analogy between this and the other systems is to be found in what is said of the ruler of the world. The true ruler of the world is not God, but a being holding precisely the place of the Gnostic Demiurgus, merely with the difference that the creation of the world cannot be predicated of him. When the four fundamental substances had come forth from the body of God and had mingled together, there arose from them a being which possessed the impulse to destroy the evil beings. This being has no other origin than God, the origin of all. Its evil nature, however, came not from God, but arose apart from God, by the will of the mingling fundamental substances themselves; yet not against, nay not even without, the will of God; for no being, least of all one that has authority, one that is placed above many others, can come into existence accidentally, without God's will. To this being, described at least thus far as evil, God has delegated the rule over the present world, and the execution of the law, or the punishment of evil. The whole order of the world is accordingly divided into two kingdoms, the present and the future world, or the left and the right hand or power of God. Over against the evil ruler of the present world stands Christ, the good

¹ The conclusion of the Homilies, first added in Dressel's edition of them, Gött. 1853. Hom. xx. 5 gives a more detailed explanation of the relation of matter to God. Cf. Uhlhorn, *op. cit.*, p. 179, *sq.*

² Hom. xvi. 12. χεῖρ δημιουργοῦσα τὸ πᾶν.

ruler of the future world.¹ This evil being is thus also one who, in the punishment of evil, executes the law, and represents in himself the conception of righteousness, like the Demiurgus of Marcion. But with all that separates him, as evil, from God, and makes him the principle of the demonic, he is not allowed to stand in such an antithesis to God as the Demiurgus of Marcion. The latter, being a creator distinct from the highest God, and a second God by the side of the one and absolute God, is a chief object of the polemic which the Homilies direct against the older Gnostic systems. The general tendency of this system is thus to limit and modify, without absolutely rejecting, the Gnostic ideas, even the Gnostic dualism, in such a way, as to prevent any encroachment upon the fundamental doctrine of God's absolute monarchy, and to reduce the antithesis of two opposite principles till it becomes nothing more than a duality immanent in the being of God. And its character is also analogous to that of the Gnostic systems, inasmuch as it also has a process of world-development: only that it is in the form of its syzygies that it presents that process. The notion of syzygy is held by the Homilies in a sense different from that usually adopted by Gnosticism; it is in virtue of their antithesis that the conceptions which form a syzygy are thus related to each other.² The law of the universe is the law of antithesis, or of syzygies. God being himself one from the beginning, divided everything into antitheses, right and left, heaven and earth, day and night, light and fire, life and death. But after man, the order of the syzygies was reversed. At first, the better preceded, the inferior followed; now the worse became the first, and the better the second. Adam, the man made in the image of God, was followed first by unrighteous

¹ Hom. xix. 7, vii. 3, iii. 19. It is only in the conclusion of the Homilies that we find the doctrine of the devil, as the ruler of this world, completed and made clearly intelligible. On the one hand, the devil is not properly an evil, but a righteous, God-serving being; on the other, there is a final transformation of the devil, of the evil into the good. While by reason of his origin from *κράσις* he has an evil *προαίρεσις*, he receives through *μετασύγκρασις* a *προαίρεσις ἀγαθῆς*. xx. 9.

² God διείλε everything at its extreme, διχῶς καὶ ἐναντίως. This is the idea of syzygy, as stated in the chief passage on the subject, Hom. ii. 15.

Cain, and then by righteous Abel. Adam himself was made according to that first divine order: in the syzygy which he forms with Eve, he, the better member, precedes, and Eve, the inferior, follows. The reversal of the syzygies is in this system what the fall of Sophia from the pleroma is in the Valentinian—a rent introduced into the whole world-order, which had to come about sooner or later, but admits of no further explanation. The very existence of syzygies, the duality of a male and a female principle, the division into antitheses, all this is an original defect inherent in the finite nature of the world. This defect, this weak side of the universe, is brought into prominence and becomes predominant, when the female precedes the male, and the worse is always the first, which has to be overcome by the better. Such then is the order in which the process of the world's history is here developed. Its moving principle is not the real antithesis of the spiritual and the psychical, but the ideal antithesis of true and false prophecy. There are two kinds of prophecy, a male and a female, related as truth to error, or as the future to the present world. The relation of the present to the future world is the type of the order in which the members of the syzygies succeed one another. The little is first, the great second; it is thus with the world and eternity. The present world is temporal, the future eternal. First is ignorance, then knowledge. Those who exercise the prophetic gift are arranged in the same way. As the present world is female, and, as a mother of children, gives birth to souls, while the future world is male, and, as a father, takes up the children; so in this world the prophets who appear with true knowledge as sons of the future world, come not first, but follow after.¹ The only application of this law of syzygies to the history of the world and religion is the statement about Adam, that he appeared again at various times under various names, before the flood as Enoch, after it as Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses. Lastly, he appeared as Christ. In Christ the syzygy is more definitely presented, being plainly seen in the contrast which he bears to his forerunner John

¹ Hom. ii. 25.

or Elias. The relation of the two is that of sun and moon. This relation is seen again in Simon Magus—who was the first disciple of the Baptist, and succeeded fully to his position after his death—and the apostle Peter. The same antithesis then which is exhibited in the relation of the present and the future worlds, is carried on through the present world itself under various forms. The worse, the female, ever comes first; the better, the male, follows after. If, however, we merely find the same antithesis continually repeated, if Christ is at last merely what Adam, Adam who is identical with Christ, was at first, we must ask, what is the general goal of the development? It can only be the dissolution and transition of the present into the future world. This, however, does not take place through such a process of development as that set forth in the other Gnostic systems. The general form of view which underlies the system of the Homilies, is not time and motion in time, so much as space and extension in space. The one true God, who in the most perfect form presides over the universe, and who, wherever he is, is as the heart of the universe in the centre of the infinite, sends forth from himself as centre six dimensions, upward and downward, to the right and to the left, forward and backward. It is true, it is said here that, directing his gaze towards these six dimensions, as a number equal on all sides, he completes the world in six periods of time. Still the fundamental mode of view is concerned with space, with being which rests in space. As that in which all existence comes to rest, he has his likeness, as the beginning and end of all, in future infinite time. For the six infinite directions return to him, and from him everything takes its extension into the infinite: this is the mystery of the number seven. He is the point of rest for all; and if any one within his small sphere imitates his greatness, him he allows to attain to rest in himself.¹ Here, to say the least, there is no state-

¹ Hom. 17, 9. Dualism is lost in the monotheism of this system; and the duality of principles becomes a condition immanent in the nature of God—matter being the body which is animated by the spirit of God, and Sophia, in her unity with God, as his soul, being both monad and duad. But this only shows the more clearly that Gnostic pantheism is the fundamental view of the system. It

ment of a process of world-development carried on in time. And yet the system of the Homilies is true to the fundamental character of Gnosticism; for in this system also it is through antitheses that the whole process of mediation and reconciliation is carried through. We have seen that in the system of Marcion the antithesis of the real world-principles—spirit and matter—merely serves as a foundation and condition precedent of the contrast between the Law and the Gospel; the use of the former antithesis is to render possible a knowledge of the two latter supreme ethical principles in their radical distinction from each other, and of what they actually are in themselves. In the system of the Homilies we have the same genuinely Gnostic striving after positive knowledge. The cosmogony and the metaphysics of the system are subsidiary to the great end of raising the moral and religious consciousness to the standpoint of absolute knowledge. False and true prophecy or religion are here what the Law and the Gospel are with Marcion. There is a true, and there is a false prophecy; and together, they constitute the essence, and they guide the course, of the history of the world and of religion. Now, since the distinction between them is so infinitely great, and nothing can be more important for man than to be acquainted with it, there must be a test by which man can distinguish the two, and know absolutely what is false in the false prophecy and true in the true. For this reason, God has founded the whole order of the world upon the law of syzygies. As a teacher of truth, that the knowledge of that which is might be possible to man, God has clearly revealed the canon of syzygies in the nature that He has made.¹ By this supreme and most universal test truth may be known and error distinguished. In accordance with this canon, Simon Magus is known for a false

is simply Gnostic pantheism that we have before us in the immanent relation of God and the world. The relation of God to the world is that of centre to circumference, *οὐσία* to *μετουσία*, 17. 7.

¹ Hom. ii. 15. *ἔνθεν γοῦν ὁ θεὸς διδασκαλῶν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὄντων ἀλήθειαν, εἰς ὃν αὐτὸς διχῶς καὶ ἐναντίως διεῖλεν πάντα τὰ τῶν ἄκρων, ἀπαρχῆς αὐτὸς εἰς ὃν καὶ μόνος θεὸς, ποιήσας οὐρανὸν καὶ γῆν, ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα, φῶς καὶ πῦρ, ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην, ζῶν καὶ θάνατον.* Cf. iii. 16.

prophet: for Peter did not come till after him; Peter follows him as light follows darkness, knowledge ignorance, recovery sickness. The false Gospel must first come by a deceiver; then, and not till then, the true one can be spread abroad for the refutation of future heresies. After him again, Antichrist must come first; then only will the true Christ, Jesus, appear; and thereupon eternal light will dawn, and all darkness disappear.¹ Antithesis thus follows antithesis, that the knowledge of truth to be brought about by means of the antitheses may more and more be deep and universal. Now truth is from the beginning one and the same; there is no essential distinction even between Mosaism and Christianity, their contents being really the same; and so the goal of the whole development must be to make truth known, and to introduce it into the general consciousness of humanity. The only reason why Christianity marks an epoch is, that in virtue of its spreading the Gospel even among the Gentiles, it is the completion of universalism. Another point in which this system coincides with Gnosticism is, that Christ is with it a universal world-principle. What gives unity to the whole process of the world's history, whose moving principle is the law of syzygies, is this; it is ever the same one true prophet, the man made by God, and endowed with the Holy Spirit of Christ, who from the beginning of the world's course passes through all its periods, changing at each stage both his name and form, and at last, after times appointed for him, receives his recompense for the work that he has undertaken, when he arrives, anointed with the mercy of God, at everlasting rest.

The ultimate distinction between the system of the Homilies and the older Gnostic systems may be thus expressed. In the former a strict adherence to the principle of unity makes Gnostic dualism appear as a thing immanent in monotheism. From the transcendental metaphysics of the Gnostic cosmogony, we here descend to the history of the world and religion, there to follow out the antitheses through which the knowledge of the essentially true and the self-existent is rendered possible. In the older systems

¹ Hom. ii. 17.

there was already some preparation for this transition ; namely, in the idea of the "spiritual." The element of the spiritual natures is knowledge ; they are spirit freed from all material or animal darkening of its consciousness, self-conscious, knowing, ever rising to the knowledge of that which is essentially true. Gnosticism in all its forms is the knowledge of the absolute, absolute knowledge ; only, the object which it places before itself varies. In the older systems it is the absolute, generally, with the antitheses of the principles ; with Marcion it is the antithesis of Christian and pre-Christian, or of the Law and the Gospel ; in the Homilies that of true and false prophecy.

The three forms of Gnosticism with which our discussion has now presented us may also be distinguished according to the three forms of religion whose multifarious elements go to make up the Gnostic doctrines. In the earlier systems the symbolic and mythical mode of view proper to heathen antiquity prevails ; the pre-Christian is the prelude of Christianity, and the distinction between the two is wavering and unfixd. The system of Marcion concerns itself with the pure conception of Christianity, disengaged from all foreign elements. In the Homilies, Christianity is only purified and expanded Judaism. While the earlier systems placed Judaism at a very subordinate stage, and Marcion even denied it all religious value, in the Homilies it is the absolute religion. In order to hold this position, however, the Homilies were driven to employ an arbitrary method of dealing with the Scriptures. The depreciation of Judaism by the earlier Gnostics was founded on certain passages of the Old Testament, in which they found the chief proofs of their assertion that the Demiurgus, as the God of the Jews, was only a weak and limited being ; the Homilies declared all these passages to be spurious interpolations. Thus one form of Gnosticism is the denial of the other ; and the opposition they bear to each other is according to their historical order. The ancient Gnostics built many of their doctrines on allegory ; Marcion rejected allegory. His doctrine again was opposed by that of the Homilies ; for there can be no doubt that the false doctrine, which

the Homilies combat in Simon Magus as a new form of heathen polytheism, is Marcion's Gnosticism. These several forms, then, not only succeed one another historically, but are intimately connected with, and supplementary of, one another; and in these several stages, Gnosticism has worked out its idea and accomplished its course. The essence of Gnosticism is the endeavour to comprehend the stages of religious history, as that which they are in their true nature, or philosophically. It could thus take up its absolute standpoint either in a form of Christianity approaching as closely as possible to Paganism, or in pure Christianity, or in a Christianity identical with Judaism.¹

¹ Another peculiar form of Gnosticism, which without doubt belongs to a later time, when the influence of Manicheism was felt, is the system of the above-mentioned (p. 211) *Πίστις Σοφία*. To establish a clear connection between the several leading ideas of this work, and to give an intelligible and comprehensive view of the whole system, was a difficult task, and the manner in which K stlin addressed himself to the work, in his Dissertation in the Theol. Jahrb., 1854, *Das gnostische System des Buches Πίστις Σοφία*, deserves grateful acknowledgment. The *Πίστις Σοφία*, according to K stlin, is distinguished from the other Gnostic systems by its monistic character and its practical religious tendency. With respect to its fundamental mode of view, it is still occupied with the antithesis of spirit and matter. But matter, though impure, is not originally an evil principle. The whole universe has arisen by emanation. In the highest region of the divine realm of light, infinitely exalted above all worlds and heavens, the Ineffable of his free will sends forth from himself the beings, of luminous nature, that rest in his bosom and strive to go forth to an independent reality of their own; this region is such a purely spiritual realm of perfect law and harmony, that Sophia is deposed from the seat which she holds in the Valentinian pleroma to a more distant sphere. The idea of a fall from the infinite and a return to it is the subject treated throughout. It is so treated that the fate of Sophia, her fall, penitence, and redemption, become types prefiguring what is afterwards to be realised in mankind in exactly the same way. The world has been made, i.e. has come forth from the Ineffable, by means of the first mystery, only in order that the latter and the other mysteria purgatores and remissores, i.e. the hidden powers of the Deity, which preside over the purification of the world by conversion and penitence, may be able to translate into action their tendency to a purifying activity. Through the whole range of the boundless universe, itself brought forth by means of these powers, their activity is to extend, overcoming even the fall and the opposition offered to good. The mysteries are finally to make manifest the eternal exaltation of the divine over all that is finite, the infinitely reconciling and blessing power and life of the good principle. A peculiarity of the system is its doctrine of mysteries. The idea of the mysteries includes all on which the welfare and permanence of the world and mankind depend.

Another phase of Gnosticism, usually termed Docetism, still remains to be examined. Docetism involves a question which goes deeply into the nature of Gnosticism, and is of considerable moment for our view of the latter. The more universal, comprehensive, and transcendent the point of view from which Gnosticism regarded Christianity, the more pressing became the question, what was the relation of Gnostic to historical Christianity? did not Gnosticism cast doubt upon the historical facts of Christianity,

The mysteries generate, rule, reconcile, and save the beings who stand under them. The whole of Christianity is thus that introduction or leading down of the mysteries to the world, which, effected by Christ, is to make the world and the realm of light known to one another, to reconcile them and unite them for ever. The two fundamental ideas of the system, alike essential, are those of righteousness and grace. Either through conversion and amendment, or through utter annihilation, evil is to disappear, and the final goal of the whole world-process to be reached, viz., the purification of the universe from all that is unworthy and perverted. Here, on the one hand, the question of practical religion is placed first, and the one aim is to bring before man, in all its extent and gravity, the finiteness of his nature, his dependence on the lower and worldly powers, his incapacity to raise himself above them without the help of some higher redeeming power; and, at the same time, to give him the assurance that a redeeming power is really present in the universe, and has appeared in Christ. But, on the other hand, the mode of attaining this practical aim is conditioned by the foundations of the system, which are laid in Gnostic metaphysics. Not until a view of the infinite exaltation and glory of the supra-celestial region of light and its principles has been gained, is it possible to comprehend the manner in which the finite returns to the infinite, or rather, is taken back into itself and united with itself by the infinite from which it proceeded. This system, therefore, bears a very close affinity to those that are classed under the first of the chief forms of Gnosticism, especially to Ophitism; but it is raised above them by its moral spirit and its comparative freedom from dualism and from the spirit of particularism. According to Küstlin, p. 188, *sq.*, the *Πίστις Σοφία* affords a convincing proof, not only that the later epoch of Gnosticism was a period of decay and dissolution, but also that many attempts were then made to bring back Gnostic doctrine to greater harmony with the spirit of Christianity and the demands of the moral consciousness, to maintain interest in it by bold speculations concerning the world beyond the grave, and to combine it with all available elements of other existing systems. This appears most clearly (says Küstlin) in that part of the book from which it derives its name, the passages setting forth the doctrine of Sophia. Notwithstanding the Ophitic basis of thought, Sophia is conceived, as with Valentinus (though in a yet more spiritual manner), as the representative of the finite spirit's longing for knowledge of the infinite; and with the addition of the ethical element, she becomes also the type of faith, penitence, and hope.

and upon its historical character generally, in a way which the Christian consciousness could not possibly allow? The name Docetism, as used to designate the Gnostic view of Christianity as more or less docetic, informs us that this question really arose. By this name we understand the assertion that Christ, as it is said even in 1 John iv. 3, had not really come in the flesh, that is, had not had a true and real body, like another ordinary man.¹ Now the body is the material basis of human existence. It follows immediately, therefore, from this assertion, that, Christ having had no real body, the reality of the facts historically connected with his person, and the historical character of Christianity, are also brought into question. All the events in which his body was supposed to be concerned, and notably his passion, are not anything that really happened: it is merely thought that they so happened; they are only something represented, only *δοκῆσει* or *κατὰ δόκησιν*, something docetic.² The comparative deviations of

¹ Compare the Epistles of Ignatius. Ep. ad Smyrn. cap. 5: τὸν κύριον βλασφημεῖ, μὴ ὁμολογῶν αὐτὸν σαρκόφορον.

² Ignat. loc. cit. cap. 2. "Ἀπιστοὶ τινες λέγουσιν τὸ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν πεπονθέναι, αὐτοὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ὄντες. Though Docetism is a part of the general character of Gnosticism, the Docetae are sometimes spoken of as a particular Gnostic sect. Clement of Alexandria mentions (Strom. iii. 13) Cassian, a pupil of the school of Valentinus, who shared with Tatian the principles of the Encratites, as the ἐξάρχων τῆς δοκῆσεως. The author of the Philosophoumena, without naming a founder, speaks of the Docetae as a peculiar sect which had of itself assumed that name; introducing them in company with Monoimus, Tatian, Hermogenes, the Quartodecimans, the Montanists, and the Encratites. They conceived God as the first principle, under the figure of a seed, containing the infinitely great in the infinitely small. The world grew out of God as the fig-tree from the seed. As the fig-tree consists of stem, leaves, and fruit, so from the first principle there arose three Aeons; and these, by reason of the perfection of the number ten, multiplied themselves tenfold to thirty Aeons. The Redeemer is the common product of all the Aeons, the expression of their unity; he is the unity of the principle which, identical with itself, is in all things that have come into being. As there are thirty Aeons, so the Redeemer assumes thirty forms (*ιδέας*). Hence it comes that every heresy has a different idea of the Redeemer, and each takes the Redeemer, conceived according to its own idea, to be the only true one (*διὰ τοῦτο τοσαῦται αἱρέσεις ζητοῦσι τὸν Ἰησοῦν περιμαχήτως, καὶ ἔστι πάσαις οἰκείος αὐταῖς, ἄλλη δὲ ἄλλος ὁρώμενος ἀπ' ἄλλου τόπου, ἐφ' ὃν ἐκάστη φέρεται, φησὶν, καὶ σπεύδει δοκοῦσα τοῦτον εἶναι μόνον, ὃς ἐστὶν αὐτῆς συγγενής, ἴδιος καὶ πολίτης*, etc., 8, 10, p. 268). This doctrine of the Docetae then is merely an expression of the general

the Gnostic systems from historical Christianity may therefore be measured according to their various views with respect to the nature of Christ's body. The position of Basilides seems to have been nearest to the common idea of the body of Christ and his birth from the Virgin Mary.¹ Valentinus and other Gnostics, however, supposed that he was not born of Mary, but only through (*διὰ*) Mary; that he passed through her as through a channel; that his birth was only a birth in appearance.² The Valentinians certainly held that Christ possessed no more than a psychical body, but the question was very much disputed among them, and was the occasion of their being divided into two schools: the Anatolian and the Italiot. According to the latter, to which Heracleon and Ptolemaeus belonged, Jesus had a natural body, and for that reason the Spirit descended on him at his baptism. The former, and here we may name Axionicus and Adresianes, considered that the body of the Soter was spiritual, because the Holy Spirit, *i.e.* Sophia and the demiurgic formative power of the Highest, had descended upon Mary. The most decided Docetism was taught by Marcion. According to him, Christ's whole manifestation was a mere appearance and phantasm. Not even the slightest contact with the kingdom of the Demiurgus and its material life was to be admitted. Christ was therefore not even born in appearance, but descended directly from heaven to earth.³

character of Gnosticism, a fundamental view of which it is that, as opposed to the one objective absolute principle, all that has come into being is but a subjective idea, fashioned according to the variety of aspect under which it is imaged in the idea-forming consciousness. In a word, Gnostic Docetism is that side of Gnosticism which may be called idealism; and since it speaks of *ἰδέαι*, this term is especially appropriate. While Gnosticism endeavoured to comprehend the absolute, or to enable the consciousness to approach that which is in itself, there was forced on it the perception that the process on which it was employed was purely phenomenological; that its metaphysics could never conduct it beyond subjective consciousness. Exactly where the elements of its structure should have met and exhibited concrete reality of existence—as in the person of the Redeemer—there being was dissolved into a mere *δοκεῖν*.

¹ In the Philos., vii. 26, p. 241, it is in accordance with the doctrine of Basilides that Jesus is directly called *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας*.

² Comp. Tert. adv. Valent., cap. 27. Theod. Haer. fab. v. 11.

³ Comp. Die christliche Gnosis, p. 235, sq.

Comparing these various opinions, we see plainly the close connection of the docetism and the dualism of the Gnostic systems. Redemption, according to Gnostic doctrine, consists in the liberation of the spiritual from the material and psychical; and thus it is inherent in the idea of the Redeemer, that he must come as little as possible into contact with the psychical.¹ It is true that a human body, to be substantial, must contain a material element; but the strong repulsion of the two principles of spirit and matter makes it essential to give such a preponderance to the spiritual as to exclude everything material. The inevitable conclusion is, that the body of the Redeemer had not the concrete reality of human existence. If he nevertheless appeared with a human body, that body was a mere presentation corresponding to no reality. And what is true of the body of Christ is true of his personality in general. The body of Christ has no material substratum, and so his personality is destitute of the concrete contents of a human existence. The Gnostic Christ is too immaterial to plant his foot firmly on the earth, or to be bound up with the organic system of human life. His self-consciousness has its centre of gravity in the transcendental region of the world of Aeons; and he suddenly floats down from on high, in order to pass a brief existence in a human form and presence. This cannot be said to be a human being. In addition to this there is nothing left by Gnostic doctrine that can be regarded as the effect of the personal activity of the Redeemer. The work of the Redeemer is redemption; but what redemption is in the view of the Gnostics is plainly shown by their well-known assertion of a *φύσει σώζεσθαι*. If those who are saved are saved by nature, *i.e.* because as spiritual natures they are under a necessity of returning back at last into the pleroma, then it does not appear how their salvation requires a Redeemer at all. In the Gnostic view, salvation does not depend on action and moral performance, but consists simply in a mode of being. Knowledge as such, the knowledge of the absolute, is itself

¹ Philos. vii. 31, p. 254: διὰ τοῦτο ἀγέννητος κατῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, φησὶν (Μαρκίων) ἵνα ᾗ πάσης ἀπηλλαγμένος κακίας.

redemption and salvation.¹ When then in spiritual natures the original spiritual principle, which can never be wholly quenched, in its gradual development breaks through the material and psychical elements by which it is obscured, and illuminates the man's consciousness in such a way that he rises above the world of the Demiurgus, and becomes aware of his unity with the pleroma, then is reached the highest stage of spiritual life, which as such is also the life of salvation; and redemption is accomplished. It is true that the Gnostic systems regard the process as the work of the Redeemer. But all that this means is that they see in his appearance and action an outward representation of that which is in itself an inner process of spiritual life. That which is constantly taking place in the same way in the endless number of spiritual beings, that one act of the spirit which in every life, after going out of itself, goes back into itself, and rises to its original being, is here summed up in its unity in Christ; Christ being the universal principle and upholder of spiritual life. The concrete, the individual, the personal, is in every case lost in the generality of the idea; the Gnostic Christ merely represents a principle, the spiritual principle which underlies all forms and stages of development. The system of the Homilies is distinguished from the other Gnostic systems by its greater unity of character. And the principle which the other systems fail to keep a hold of consistently, so that with them Christ assumes a variety of forms, the Homilies fix and state distinctly in its unity, when they lay down that it is the same one prophet of truth who appears in all ages of the world, only under various forms and various names. Even in this case, what significance is left for the external manifestation and human birth of Christ? It looks as if in the system of the Homilies, Gnostic supernaturalism was about to throw off the mask completely, and to declare in so many words, that outward revelation is nothing but the immanent self-revelation of spirit. The prophet is a prophet, we are told, through his *ἐμφύτον καὶ ἀένναον πνεῦμα*; ² and this *πνεῦμα* is said to belong not only to the prophet but to

¹ Cf. Die christliche Gnosis, p. 139, sq., 489, sq.

² Hom. iii. 15.

all pious men. For, it is laid down generally, truth springs forth from the pious man's pure indwelling spirit. In this sense the apostle Peter is made to say, "So was the Son revealed to me by the Father: therefore I know of my own experience the meaning of revelation. For as soon as the Lord questioned me (Matthew xvi. 14), it rose in my heart, and I know not what came upon me, for I said, Thou art the Son of the living God. He who for this called me blessed, told me first that it was the Father who had revealed it to me. After this I perceived what revelation is; to learn a thing without outward teaching, without visions and dreams; and this is the case, for the germ of all truth is contained in the truth which God has implanted in us. This truth is concealed or discovered by God's hand alone; God working according to his knowledge of the worthiness of each." The place of the outward revelation, then, is taken by the inward: the former can only bring to consciousness the germ and principle of truth already deposited in the spirit of man. Here we obtain some insight into the deeper connections of a view which lies at the root of, and is the inner principle of, all the Gnostic systems, however various their outward forms. If the same divine spirit which was in Adam appeared also in Christ, then, since after being thus imparted to Adam it must have passed also to those descended from him, the divine principle in Christ is not essentially different from the divine in all other men; consequently, it is not anything that positively passes the bounds of the natural. It is the same divine spirit of man, the holy spirit of Christ, which, in the seven pillars of the world, goes through all the periods of the world's history, but which also dwells as an inmost principle in all men. The only distinction is that while in these two it appears in the strength and purity of its substance, as the pure archetypal man, in all other men it is more or less obscured. Yet even in them it is not so eclipsed and darkened, that it cannot, whether through the inward energy of the principle or by some incitement from without, break through the darkness which obscures it, and regain the full light of its self-consciousness. This Adam-Christ is as it were the male principle. What obscures and weakens it in particular individuals

is only that there is a female principle bound up with it, and that the latter has obtained the ascendant. The former is the spiritual and reasonable; the latter the sensual, and weak side of human nature, the side subject to error and sin. Hence even the phenomena wherein false prophecy or demonic heathenism manifests itself, have their ultimate source, according to the Homilies, in a principle dwelling in man himself. The two principles of reason and sense are thus for the individual man and for human nature regarded in its essence, what on a larger scale Judaism and heathenism are for the world's history. In each case appears the same duality—a male and a female principle. Thus we have only to strip off the symbolic mythical clothing in which Gnostic supernaturalism wraps itself, and to take the forms in which it personifies its conceptions for what they are in themselves, and we have the true kernel of the Gnostic view of the world in a very transparent rationalism, founded on the immanent relations of the self-consciousness of the spirit. Even if there was no very direct consciousness of this rationalism, still its principle is essentially involved in the notion of Gnosticism; and it thus appears that Docetism was merely the point at which this rationalising tendency—present, whether more or less developed, in all Gnosticism—reached its clearest and most unmistakable outward manifestation. It lies in the nature of the case and is unavoidable, that, in proportion as stress is laid on general speculative or religious ideas, the historical reality of the facts of Christianity should be thrown into the background. In the presence of the idea the element of fact receives only a secondary importance, or may even become a mere figurative reflection of the idea. Such is the true significance of Gnostic Docetism. It makes an assertion with regard to the body of Christ which is essentially true of Gnosticism as a whole. The body of Christ lacks the concrete reality of a human body; and in the same way, it is the general character of Gnosticism to refine and generalise away the positive contents of historical Christianity. Christianity becomes a part of the general view of the world; it is interpreted as one stage in the universal process of world-development. The Gnostic Christ is a universal principle, which conditions,

as in the earlier systems, the real process of world-development, or at least, as in the system of the Homilies, the knowledge of truth generally. Christianity (according to the Gnostics) is concerned, not with the mere question of salvation—how is man saved? but with one more universal—what is the beginning, the course, the goal, of the world-development? or, how is it possible to attain to absolute knowledge of the true, of that which is in itself? When occupied with the question of salvation, Christianity was in danger of withering away into Jewish particularism. In the same way, when occupied with the problems raised by Gnosticism, it was on the point of dissolving into the thin element of a general transcendental view of the world. Both dangers needed to be met by the catholic tendency of Christianity, as worked out in the realisation of the Church. But before we turn to this side of the development of the Church's history, Montanism claims our attention.

II—MONTANISM.

GNOSTICISM AND MONTANISM have this in common that they are both concerned with questions which go back to first principles, questions relating to nothing less than the course of the world in general. The difference between them is, that while Gnosticism contemplates the point of commencement, whence all proceeds, the absolute principles that condition the process of God's self-revelation and the course of the world-development, in Montanism the cardinal point round which everything revolves is the end of things, the catastrophe towards which the course of the world is moving on. They also differ widely from each other in respect of the range of ideas with which they are conversant. Gnosticism enters into broad views of the universe, such as had been opened up, and made attractive by the boldest speculative ideas of the philosophy of the age; Montanism does not advance beyond the Jewish Messianic idea. These differences however, do not take away what the two systems have in common. Indeed, the two phenomena which we have coupled together may both be traced up into the primitive Christian mode of view. The elements of both are to be found there. Paul approaches the Gnostic view of the world, when in speaking of the two world-periods, the pre-Christian and the Christian, he regards them in the light of general principles which determine the development of humanity, and when he distinguishes separate steps in a course of the world that returns into the absolute unity of God. Montanism, again, is derived entirely from the primitive Christian idea of the immediate coming of Christ, a belief which Paul also shared. Before going on to Montanism then, we may appropriately consider this belief which is so marked a feature

of the original Christian consciousness. The belief in the second coming of Christ, and the reaction against a view of the world which had lost its hold upon this belief, are the two leading momenta which serve to explain the origin and character of Montanism.

What connected Christianity with Judaism most directly and most intimately was the Jewish Messianic idea; though from it also there arose the sharpest antithesis by which the two faiths came to be separated from each other. It had been thought that Jesus was the promised Messiah, who had appeared with a view to the fulfilment of the Messianic expectations. His death seemed to leave these hopes unfulfilled, and to destroy them for ever: the disciples, as Jews possessed with the Messianic belief, felt that such an event made it impossible to apply the belief to him. But the gulf lying between idea and fact was only too soon filled up. He had not, as the living Messiah, fulfilled what was hoped of him; but as the risen Messiah, exalted to heaven, he might return from heaven again, now at length to accomplish all that had not yet come about. The Parousia of Christ became a necessary postulate of the faith of the first disciples; the old belief had assumed a new form, but it was impossible to renounce the substance of it, and it seemed to be a necessity that it should be fulfilled without delay. Many passages of the books of the New Testament show with what power this belief reigned in the minds of the first Christians. So much was this the case, that in this respect there was no essential difference between the apostle of the Gentiles and the author of the Apocalypse. If any of the first publishers of Christianity was capable of discerning that its destiny—its exaltation into the universal religion—was only to be fulfilled in the distant future, it was Paul. Yet even he, as he thinks on Christ's coming, firmly believes that all is now approaching its end, and that he will himself live to see the great catastrophe. Such a belief, however, too surely brought its own refutation to last long in all its strength and vividness. The longer it remained unfulfilled, the more inevitably it tended to lose its hold on the mind of the age. Even within the New Testament itself, we can trace the various modifica-

tions which it gradually underwent. Compare the two books which vary most widely in their manner of stating it; what a discrepancy of tone do we find between the Apocalypse, where it blazes out in its brightest flame, and takes its most concrete form in the idea of the millennium, and the Second Epistle of Peter. The author of the latter speaks of scoffers who shall come in the last days, walking after their own lusts, and saying, "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the creation;" and instead of questioning the facts on which the scoffer proceeded, he merely seeks to refute him by substituting for the belief itself a recognition of the general truths that lie at its base. This shows us pretty plainly what the state of belief on the subject was at this time. But though it had ceased, at least in its original form, to be a universal article of Christian faith, still there could not fail to be some, who in contrast to the increasing worldliness of the Christian mind which was manifested in the decay of this belief, quickened it in themselves even to a stronger life, and held it fast with fresh enthusiasm. Such were the Montanists; and this is one of their most prominent traits. Even though it be admitted that millenarianism was at the time a universal Christian belief, still the Montanists were the most pronounced of all millenarians. It was this doctrine that especially kindled their enthusiasm: their prophets announced, in language like that of men inspired, the judgments which were impending with the coming of Christ, the reign of a thousand years, and the end of the world, and depicted all that was coming in the most vivid colours. How much they were occupied with the thought of the immediate end of the world, and how real the thought was to them, is shown by the saying of the prophetess Maximilla, "After me comes nothing but the end of the world?"¹ Soon as the consummation might come, it could not approach too quickly for their millenarian spirit. In their daily prayer, to ask that God's kingdom might come was to give utterance to their millenarian view of the world; the kingdom of God and the end

¹ Μετ' ἐμὲ οὐκέτι προφήτης ἔσται, ἀλλὰ συντέλεια.

of the world were with them the same idea.¹ Even then, though the whole generation for which the coming of Christ was supposed to have been promised, had but looked for it in vain, still the belief itself that in the immediate future Christ would appear, and the kingdom of God begin, was not abandoned. The Montanists knew the spot where the heavenly Jerusalem would descend; they had even had a vision foreshadowing the descent from heaven. With other Christians, coldness and lukewarmness had laid hold of millenarianism; but for that very reason it became all the stronger and livelier with them. And this shows us how close was the connection between the millenarian belief of the Montanists and another no less characteristic part of their system, ecstatic prophecy. If they were living entirely in the thought of Christ's coming and of the future, and saw close at hand the events that were to introduce and accompany the impending catastrophe, this contemplation of the future in the present inevitably gave rise to prophecy. Prophecy with the Montanists assumed the form of ecstasy; a fact very characteristic of the sect, though ecstasy itself was by no means an uncommon thing. Ecstasy is merely prophecy intensified. By a natural analogy, as millenarianism among the Montanists advanced to fresh energy, prophecy also, as the expression of their millenarian inspiration, soared with a loftier flight, and became ecstasy. Here the finite subject became absolutely passive under the divine principle. Hence the saying of Montanus, in which he compares man to the lyre, the Paraclete to the plectrum, and calls the former a sleeper, the latter a watcher; and the belief that the special organs of the Holy Spirit were women, prophetesses such as Maximilla and Priscilla. The one belief naturally gained

¹ Compare Tertullian, *De Orat.* c. 5; where he says of the *veniat regnum tuum*; *Itaque si ad Dei voluntatem et ad nostram suspensionem pertinet regni dominici representatio, quomodo quidam pertractum quendam in seculo postulant* (how can so many ask, that the kingdom of God should further prolong itself into secular time? millenarianism was then no longer a universal belief); *quum regnum Dei quod, ut adveniat, oramus, ad consummationem seculi tendat; optamus maturius regnare et non diutius servire. Etiam si praeinitum in oratione non esset, de postulando regni adventu, ultro eam vocem postulassemus, festinantes ad spei nostrae complexum.*

strength together with the other. The believers in Christ's coming did not feel their belief disturbed by the long lapse of time to which they had now to look back. On the contrary, the longer the past period, the nearer they thought they must be to the great catastrophe. For the same reason, since everything was now in its last stage, in the *καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος*, the spirit too, the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, the principle of the Christian consciousness, must gather its energies more powerfully together, must give forth more immediate, more unequivocal utterances. Both beliefs were involved in the consciousness of living in the *dies novissimi*. Thus, Tertullian's theory of the various periods of development is, that as first the plant arises from the grain of seed, and lastly the fruit from the blossom, so *justitia* was first in the state of nature, then advanced to childhood under the guidance of the Law and the Prophets, next through the Gospel blossomed into youth, and now is brought to maturity by the Paraclete.¹ All this is but an analysis of the idea of the *novissima*. What is sought to be done is to bring out what is the last in the last things, by striking out of them all that is not the last, but must at once be followed by the last. But according to the Montanist opinion, the more nearly everything approached its end, the more everything converged in the *novissimi* dies, the more concentrated and intense, the more filled with compressed energy did everything become. Everywhere, says Tertullian, the later forms the conclusion, and that which goes before is outweighed by that which comes after. This is a universal law alike of the human and the divine order of things; and especially of the *novissimi* dies,² in which the prophecy of Joel (often cited by Tertullian), that the spirit should be poured out on all flesh, was to be fulfilled. In this period, when *tempus est in collecto*, when every force gathers itself together and prepares all its keenness, the spirit likewise enters into the mind of the Christian with unwonted power, and fills it with its own divine all-

¹ De virg. vel. c. 1.

² De Bapt. c. 13. Compare the Praef. Act. Felic. et Perp., and Epiphanius Haer. 48, 8, in Schwegler's Montan., p. 39.

illuminating essence. The Apocalypse gives virtually the same account of the relation between the novissima and the working of the spirit in connection with it. The several stages of the great catastrophe of the world are the subject of the book; the author is merely the instrument of the divine inspiration that has come upon him; he too is *ἐν πνεύματι*, i.e., in a state of ecstasy (i. 10). Prophecies and visions form the whole contents of the Apocalypse; prophecy and vision were the shapes assumed by the ecstatic condition of the Montanists. The spirit which from the first was the animating principle of the Christians, and awoke their prophetic inspiration and ecstasy, is also the principle of Montanism. At this time it was generally termed Paraclete, perhaps because in the distress and affliction of the last days it was to be not only the guide that should lead into all truth, but the intercessor, the support and comfort of all those whom it swayed with its rich and abundant power; in any case, this particular name, as applied to the Holy Spirit, was intended to mark its special and peculiar function during that last period, in which the Montanist saw everything pressing towards its end.

It is in the moral sphere that the Paraclete carries on his actual operations. He speaks with his full energy in prophetic ecstasy in order that the secrets of the future may be searched, and all the obscurities of consciousness made light. But he also insists emphatically on the moral requirements of practical Christianity. As the *spiritus sanctus*, *ipsius disciplinae determinator*, *institutor novae disciplinae*, he is the strict spirit of moral severity, the declared foe of all laxity and indifference in moral things. What he is, he is for one end only, viz., that he may in the field of morals realise that which he is; thus Tertullian, when he sums up all the features which belong to the idea of the Paraclete, gives the first place to his practical task. He opens the Scriptures, purges the understanding, raises the Christian to a higher stage of perfection, but above all, his practical aim is to give discipline its right direction.¹ The Montanists increased the severity of Chris-

¹ *De virg. vel. c. 1.*

tian discipline by several ordinances peculiar to themselves, as by the xerophagiae, by the extension of the dies stationum to the evening, and by their requirements with regard to marriage and martyrdom. But their fundamental idea, the source of all these regulations, was that the Christian lived in the last times, and stood at the end of the whole course of the world. This thought filled the Montanist's mind as a belief, and could not but determine his behaviour. He lived in the one thought that the end of the world was at hand, and discerned in all around him nothing but the signs of the advancing catastrophe. It was necessary then, that inwardly as well as outwardly he should have completely broken with the world; and his outward actions could have no other aim than that of carrying out this breach with the world in every direction, and wholly sundering the bonds by which his flesh still joined him to the world. It has been very correctly observed,¹ that in its moral requirements Montanism set up nothing new; that it was only new in so far as it was reactionary; that the only question between the Montanists and their adversaries in the Church concerned an increase of strictness in enforcing an old ordinance which was on the point of becoming obsolete; that their laws upon marriage and fasting merely aimed at the carrying out in practice of that which they recognised as a divine and eternal command, the old law laid down in both Testaments. Still the cause of this reactionary tendency was the Montanist's belief that he understood better than others the time in which the Christian was living, that he recognised it for what it was, for the last time. Further, how much must that original Christian frame of mind, resting on the belief in Christ's immediate coming, have changed and degenerated, when the duty of martyrdom was so little thought of, that whole churches purchased exemption from persecution with money and wholesale, and when bishops and clergy gave their sanction to the cowardice, and encouraged it by their example.² We may well conclude that in other respects

¹ Ritschl, *Entstehung der Altkath. Kirche*, 1st ed., p. 513; 2d ed., p. 497, 87.

² *Tert. de fuga in persec.*, cap. ii. 13.

also there had been a falling off from the strictness of the primitive custom. The Church had entered into friendship with the world. The tendency which gave rise to Montanism may therefore justly be regarded as a reactionary one. For though it was the ever-growing worldliness of Christianity against which it fought with such energy, yet its resistance was grounded on the principle of a return to that primitive standpoint at which the Christian mind, believing in the coming of Christ and the immediate end of the world, had cast itself off from all worldly interests. Accordingly, this motive tendency is continually seen in Tertullian, and appears as the basis of every precept and admonition.¹ The same tendency must be borne in mind when we seek an answer to the question—which could not before be usefully asked—What is the relation between the Paraclete and the Spirit that worked in the apostles? The Paraclete attempts to bring in no dogmatic or moral novelty; as Tertullian says, he is *restitutur potius quam institutor*. Nevertheless, his requirements exceed those of Christ and the apostles; what they had declared to be morally allowable he can no longer concede to the weakness of the flesh. But the reason of this also is to be found in the Montanist expectation. The nearer the world draws to its end, the less can the weakness of the flesh be spared. Everything that prevents the flesh from becoming holy must be utterly rooted out.² In the age succeeding the apostles, the spirit comes with stricter requirements than theirs; not that the apostles desired anything else; only their demands were not so openly and directly made. Tertullian states it as a general view that strictness is always accompanied by a certain lenity which only admits of being explained on the principle of accommodation. The Paraclete also makes use of this accommodation as the apostles had done. Christ, if his meaning be rightly understood, would have prohibited even first marriages. Only from indulgence, from accommodation to human weakness, did he refrain from totally forbidding marriage, as properly he

¹ Compare, *e.g.*, *Ad Ux.*, i. 5.

² *De Monog.* c. 3. *Caro docetur sanctitatem, quae et in Christo fuit sancta.*

should have done. In this view, the whole history of the world is a progressive accommodation ; what is at first permitted and freely granted has afterwards to be more and more restricted and withdrawn. What Moses commanded, Christ disallowed, because from the beginning it was not so ; and so the Paraclete may now disallow what Paul permitted, if only the new provision is worthy of God and Christ. Formerly it was worthy of God and Christ to put down hardness of heart, when its time was past ; it is worthy of them now to root out the weakness of the flesh, for the time is now rapidly becoming shorter. Hardness of heart prevailed till Christ came ; and the weakness of the flesh had its time, till the operation of the Paraclete began. The Lord had deferred until this period what could not be borne at that earlier period. Although the Paraclete does no more than carry out the intentions of Christ and the apostles, yet, because his action comes after theirs, it is possible for him at this later period to effect what was impossible before. Everything has thus, as a general rule, its appointed time. Strictly speaking, the flesh, the material part of humanity, has no moral justification ; what is permitted to it is a mere concession—a concession that becomes more and more inappropriate, as with the approaching end of the world the relation of the spirit to the flesh inevitably becomes more and more strained, inharmonious, and repellent. As the present order of the world is broken up, the two principles of the spirit and the flesh diverge to the full breadth of their opposition. The material principle must give way to the spiritual, and be unconditionally subordinated to it ; for, from the beginning it was only allowed to have scope in the world in order that the spiritual might display upon it its absolute power. It may be compared to a wood which is allowed to grow only that the axe may at last be laid to its root.¹ The last, the end of things, the time in which the finite is made manifest in its finiteness—this is the standpoint. The Paraclete, then, is spirit drawing back into itself as it becomes aware of the world's finiteness, and coming, in its self-consciousness, to the knowledge of its power over the flesh

¹ Tert., *De exhort. castit.*, chap. vi.

and the world. In this exaltation of the self-consciousness of spirit by means of the Paraclete, all deceitful illusion, with which the flesh surrounds it, at once disappears; rapt from the world, it sees with clear vision the temporal order of things even now collapsing in its vanity. The moral doctrine of Montanism is thus summed up in one simple requirement—to break with the world, as the world itself to the eye of the Montanist is breaking to pieces and collapsing; to dissolve the bonds by which the spirit and the flesh were held together, as the world is itself in process of dissolution.

When we have once clearly conceived the idea on which Montanism is based, and so seen what its essential nature is, we recognise the justness of the parallel that has been drawn between it and Gnosticism. Each adopts a transcendental mode of view. Each conceives the true essence of Christianity as lying far away, beyond the actual present. The Gnostic, however, looks back to a past whence all derives its first absolute beginning; the Montanist looks forward to a future wherein all reaches its end, and the present world vanishes before the world beyond. For both Christ is the absolute principle of the world; but while the Gnostic uses this principle in order to construct a whole world-development, its operation with the Montanist is only the destruction of the world. Christ has appeared as the Messiah only in order to bring all to an end, and to introduce the great catastrophe through which the present passes into the future order. In both systems, Christ, as the principle determining the process of world-development, is the turning-point, to which everything leads up in such a way that the end unites with the beginning; but while Gnosticism allows all its processes to continue through a limitless period, Montanism sees the final catastrophe arriving as soon as possible. As soon as Christ has appeared—and he is to appear in the immediate future—the world is at its end; by the mere fact of his appearance, the present order disappears and makes way for the future one. The final goal is with each system an *ἀποκατάστασις*, in which the principles, separating and taking up their

relative positions, confront each other in their purity; in Gnosticism these principles are spirit and matter, in Montanism spirit and flesh. Different as the notions were which the Gnostics and the Montanists associated with the terms spirit and spiritual, in both systems what was sought after was that Christians should be pure organs of the spiritual principle. The Gnostics considered themselves to be pre-eminently the spiritual natures, and assigned all other Christians to the stage of mere psychical life. The Montanists found in their distinction of the *πνευματικοὶ* and *ψυχικοὶ* a vantage-ground from which they could look down with disdain on the catholic Christians who did not confess their doctrine of the Paraclete. The same antithesis comprises both systems; but in the case of the Montanists its sphere is much more limited.

When we know what Montanism is, the question concerning the external circumstances of its origin becomes of less importance: its peculiarity is precisely this, that the elements from which it sprang existed from the beginning of Christianity. Least of all is any elucidation afforded by its alleged derivation from Montanus. It is therefore hardly worth while to imitate Neander in his anxiety to refute those who have even doubted the historical existence of this apocryphal personage. In the earliest Greek writers the Montanists are not spoken of under this name, but are called Cataphrygians (*οἱ κατὰ Φρύγας*) after the place where they lived and awaited the descent of the heavenly Jerusalem. All that can be said of Montanus is that he appeared as a prophet in the time of the two well-known prophetesses, Priscilla and Maximilla, or even earlier.¹ The only ground for the supposition that he spoke of himself as God the Father, or the Paraclete, is, that according to the character of ecstasy, the speaking subject was not the ecstatic prophet, but God himself, or the Holy Spirit. Montanism appeared about the middle of the second century, and after that

¹ The *Philosophoumena* do not make him the founder of a sect, but merely say (8. 19, p. 275), *καὶ τινα πρὸ αὐτῶν* (Priscilla and Maximilla), *Μοντανὸν ὁμοίως δοξάζουσιν ὡς προφήτην*.

time attracted more and more observation, as the circumstances of the growing and developing Church, and practical life, were more deeply affected by the questions which it raised. To follow its history further, therefore, it is necessary first to consider the phenomena which occupy the other side of the history from that hitherto investigated.¹

¹ What has been said above upon Montanism forms the chief contents of my dissertation in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 538, *sq.*; *Das Wesen des Montanismus nach den neuesten Forschungen*; in which is also contained a critique of the recent views on Montanism put forth since the time of Neander and Gieseler. Schwegler's work, *Der Montanismus und die christliche Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, Tübingen, 1841, first set the example of more thorough research into this subject. Neander's view of Montanism is also very one-sided. His principal source of error is that he allows himself to be misled by the vague statements we have about the person of Montanus, and consequently explains the character of Montanism by the nature-elements of the ancient Phrygian religion, and the Phrygian temperament, as manifested in the ecstasies of the priests of Cybele and Bacchus. To follow him is only to allow ourselves to be diverted, at the outset of our inquiry, from the right point of observation.

THEOLOGICAL
TRANSLATION FUND LIBRARY.

Vol. 20.

THE CHURCH HISTORY

OF

THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

VOL. II.

NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

Up to the middle of the present volume I have had the advantage of using a version of the work previously prepared for Mr. Williams. I am, of course, responsible for the whole of the translation as now published.

ALLAN MENZIES.

CONTENTS.

PART THIRD—*Continued.*

	PAGE
II.—The Catholic Church as the antithesis of Gnosticism and Montanism,	1-61
I. The Dogmatic Antithesis,	1-15
The idea of the Catholic Church,	1-3
Attitude of the Doctors of the Church to Gnosticism,	3-15
Clement of Alexandria and Origen: their affinity to Gnosticism,	3-8
Irenaeus and Tertullian: their Antithesis to Gnosticism and Philosophy,	8-11
Scripture and Tradition, Heresy and Catholic Doctrine,	11-15
II. The Hierarchical Antithesis,	16-61
The Congregational Office and the autonomy of the Congregations,	16-22
The Clergy, Presbyters and Bishops,	22-25
The Episcopate,	25
Notion of the Episcopate,	25-26
It arose out of the desire for unity and the antithesis to the Heresies,	28-30
The Pastoral Epistles,	30-31

	PAGE
Pseudo-Ignatius and Pseudo-Clement,	31-39
The idea of the Episcopate and the principle of its unity,	39-45
Montanism and the Episcopate,	45-52
The Bishops, the organs of the Spirit,	53-55
Synods,	56-58
The system of the Hierarchy,	59-61

PART FOURTH.

<i>Christianity as highest principle of Revelation; and as Dogma,</i>	62-126
Transition to Dogma,	62-64
Christology of the Synoptic Gospels and of Paul,	65-72
Of the Apocalypse,	72-74
Of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the lesser Pauline Epistles,	74-79
The Johannine Logos-notion,	79-85
The Apostolic Fathers and the Early Fathers,	86-92
The Monarchians,	92-107
1. Praxeas and Callistus,	92-94
Noetus,	94-95
Sabellius,	95-99
2. Theodotus of Byzantium and Artemon,	100-101
Beryllus of Bostra,	102-105
Paul of Samosata,	105-107
The further Development of Doctrine,	107-120
Origen,	108-112
Arianism,	112-115
The opposing Systems,	117-118
The Nicene Dogma,	118-120

CONTENTS.

ix

PAGE

Dogma in general : the Doctrine of God, of Moral Freedom, of the Church,	120-126
---	---------

PART FIFTH.


<i>Christianity as a power ruling the World : in its rela- tion to the Heathen World and to the Roman State,</i>	127-232
Transition to this Part,	127-128
I. The relation of Christianity to the Heathen World and to the Roman State, on its inner side,	129-189
The world-consciousness of the Christians,	129-131
The hatred of the Heathens, and the silent working of Christianity,	131-136
The Apologists,	136-140
The philosophically cultivated opponents,	140-189
Celsus,	140-167
Significance and plan of his work,	140-143
His attack from the Jewish standpoint,	143-146
His depreciatory verdict,	146-148
His opposition to the principle of Revela- tion,	149-155
Different arguments in comparison with Platonism,	155-158
Demonology as a chief point of contact and of difference,	159-164
Christianity a deceit and delusion, but a power of the age,	165-167
Lucian,	167-174
In what way different from Celsus,	167-168
His Peregrinus Proteus,	168-172
Christianity is fanaticism,	173-174

	PAGE
Philostratus,	174-179
His life of Apollonius of Tyana, . . .	174-177
Religious Syncretism,	178-179
Porphyrius,	179-186
His polemical work,	179-181
Critical attitude of Neoplatonism, . . .	181-184
Hierocles,	184-186
The authority of Tradition and the principle of	
Religious Liberty,	187-189
2. The relation of Christianity to the Heathen World	
and to the Roman State, on its outer side, .	190-232
Tiberius, Claudius, Nero,	190-196
Trajan, Hadrian, and the Antonines, . . .	196-206
Septimius Severus, Heliogabalus; Alexander	
Severus,	206-208
Decius, Gallienus,	208-210
Diocletian,	210-215
The religious Edicts of the Roman Emperors, .	215-221
The first, by Galerius, Constantine, and	
Licinius,	215-218
The second and third, by Constantine and Licinius,	218-221
Constantine,	221-228
His love of unity,	221-224
His Politics and Religion,	225-228
The victory of Christianity,	228-232

PART SIXTH.

<i>Christianity as a Moral Religious Principle in its</i>	
<i>absoluteness; and its limitation in time, . . .</i>	233-289
The Moral Religious Principle of Christianity;	
its universality and its energy,	233-234

	PAGE
The Moral attitude of the Christians on its bright side,	235-243
Their avoidance of the Spectacles,	236-238
Their retirement from Politics, and the in- wardness of their society among them- selves,	238-240
Wedlock and Household Life,	240-243
One-sided and narrow elements of the Christian Morality,	243-275
The fear of Demons,	244-245
The collisions of their Moral Rigorism,	245-248
Their dualistic and ascetic view of life,	249-251
Marriage,	251-263
The Gnostics,	251-257
Tertullian,	257-263
The Celibacy of the Priesthood,	264-267
Mortal and Venial Sins,	267-271
Good Works,	271-273
The idea of the Church the principle of moral action,	273-275
The purer moral principles of Clement of Alexandria,	275-277
Laxity of moral practice,	277-279
The Christian Cultus,	279-289
Its original elements,	279-280
The Eucharist and the Agapae,	280-282
The celebration of the Passover,	283-284
Sunday and the Sabbath,	284-285
Other forms of Cultus,	285-287
Saint-worship,	287-289



✓

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, AS THE ANTITHESIS OF GNOSTICISM
AND MONTANISM.

1. THE DOGMATIC ANTITHESIS.

IN Gnosticism and Montanism, the Christian life of the first post-apostolic period put forth its most vigorous energy and the richest abundance of its productive power. Gnosticism gives the clearest proof that Christianity had now become one of the most important factors of the history of the time; and it shows especially what a mighty power of attraction the new Christian principles possessed for the highest intellectual life then to be found either in the Pagan or in the Jewish world. The ingredients of Gnosticism were very multifarious; Hellenic and Jewish elements were blended together in it in manifold forms; but Christianity provided all these with a common centre, from which the numerous Gnostic systems proceeded to attempt ever new combinations of the most different kinds. The problem undertaken by all of these systems was that which then occupied the most thoughtful minds, and ever afterwards continued to be the most important subject of Christian religious philosophy, viz., how Christianity was to be interpreted in a general view of the world. And if we couple Montanism with Gnosticism, and consider how it also contributed new and energetic spiritual impulses, and raised fresh questions which were of importance not only as to practical life, but also as to the true construction to be given to Christianity, we receive a very life-like impression of the spiritual movement of the time, and of the restless ferment in which so many elements were confusedly heaving, and meeting and crossing one another in the most various directions. But in view of

these widely diverging movements, a counter-action was necessary, if Christianity was not to lose its original peculiar character. On the one side, the practical religious interest of Christianity, that which the Christian consciousness immediately affirmed, had to be maintained and asserted against the transcendental Gnostic speculations; and, on the other, that millenarian fanaticism had to be combated, which precluded the very possibility of any historical development whatever, and the ground had to be won whereon Christianity could plant itself firmly in the world. The first necessity of all, then, was to have a point of union, by means of which allied and accordant elements might be held together, and an adequate counterpoise be opposed to all heterogeneous and eccentric tendencies alike. This is the idea of the Catholic Church. Already this idea had wrought as a higher power, rising superior to the opposition of Jewish and Gentile Christianity, and uniting both in one common interest. And now, appearing as the antithesis of Gnosticism and Montanism, it attained a more definite consciousness, and, as the circle of its influence extended, showed more and more what were its own true shape and character.

The great struggle with Gnosticism, which lasted through the whole of the second century, and forms so important a part of the history of the development of Christianity and of the Christian Church, was twofold—both dogmatic and ecclesiastical. The whole character of Gnosticism was widely alien to Christianity, as indeed was inevitable from the nature of the elements from which it proceeded. So much was this the case that in each of its forms Gnosticism entered on a fresh battle with Christianity. The antithesis of the two principles, with the dualism resulting therefrom, and the Gnostic repugnance to everything material—the series of Aeons, intended to stand as connecting links between God and the world, and which placed the doctrine of an emanation of the world from God in the place of the Jewish-Christian conception of a free creation—the separation of the Creator from the one supreme God—the co-ordination of Christ with other

divine beings, whose likeness to him could only be regarded as a derogation from his absolute dignity—the whole process of world-development, into which Christianity was interwoven in such a manner that the facts of the redemption accomplished through Christ inevitably lost their moral and religious meaning, and even their historical character: all this stood in the most decided opposition to the fundamental view of the Christian consciousness. Undeveloped as Christian dogma still was—and it was chiefly through its opposition to Gnosticism that it became more accurately fixed and defined—yet from the very first a Christian antithesis could be found for each Gnostic doctrine. On the other hand, a considerable part of Gnosticism possessed an affinity and accordance with Christianity; and as soon as Christianity had spread to some extent among the upper classes, every cultivated man, every man initiated into the ruling ideas of the age, felt that he was directly called upon to answer for himself the same question which the Gnostics were endeavouring to solve. The relation of Christianity to Gnosticism therefore could by no means be one of mere hostility and repulsion; and it was natural that in the controversy the doctors of the Church should take up various positions.

Least of all could those who lived in the circle of ideas whence Gnosticism itself had come forth in the persons of its most eminent chiefs assume an attitude of simple opposition. Alexandria, the birthplace of Gnosticism, is also the birthplace of Christian theology, which in fact, in its earliest forms, aimed at being nothing but a Christian Gnosticism. Among the Fathers, Clement of Alexandria and Origen stand nearest to the Gnostics. They rank *γνῶσις* above *πίστις*, and place the two in such an immanent relation to one another, that neither can exist without the other: knowledge cannot exist apart from the actual subject-matter of faith, nor faith without the exaltation of its subject-matter to the form of knowledge. Thus they adopt the same point of view as the Gnostics. It is their aim, by drawing into their service all that the philosophy of the age could contribute, to interpret Christianity in its historical connection, and to take up its subject-

matter into their thinking consciousness. Clement in particular is so completely occupied with the idea of the absolute, which he holds to be the true object of the Christian consciousness, that like the Gnostics he considers the highest task of his Gnosis to be self-elevation from the finite to the absolute. The only distinction is, that he makes the knowing mind, instead of the real world, to be the scene of the process by which the Gnostics saw everything spiritual return, in intimate connection with the whole world-development, into the absolute or the pleroma. As the world and the whole life of nature move in the cycle of the number seven, so it is through the hebdomad alone, Clement says, that the Gnostic reaches his absolute goal. To whatever the hebdomad refers—whether it be a period of time that arrives at its point of repose in the course of seven determined ages, or seven heavens, reckoned in ascending order; or whether, if the unchanging sphere which is close to the intelligible world is to be called the ogdoad—in any case the Gnostic must certainly work his way through the world of birth and sin. For this reason victims are slain for sinners during seven days, and purifications are performed for seven days, because in so many days what is rising into existence attains its completion. The perfect appropriation, however, is the belief, rich in grace, in the Gospel, which is attained through the Law and the Prophets, and the purity which is acquired through perfect obedience, joined with that putting away of all things worldly, by which the soul gives back with thanks the tabernacle that she has used. The true Gnostic is one of those who, as David says, Psalm xv. 1, shall find their rest upon the holy hill of God, in the highest Church, where shall assemble the philosophers of God, the true Israelites, those who are pure of heart and without guile.¹ At this highest stage, according to Clement, Gnosticism or Christianity, as the absolute religion, accomplishes for the Gnostic its highest task; in two ways, theoretically and practically. Theoretically, when the limbs of the body of truth, dissevered as it were and scattered in countless places, are brought together in their unity under his

¹ Strom. vi. 16; vii. 10; iv. 25; vi. 14.

view ; for he who combines that which is separated, and brings it into unity, will see without danger the perfect Logos, the truth.¹ Practically, when there arises an entirely passionless tendency of the whole mind and life towards the absolute, making the Gnostic like his teacher the Logos in freedom from passion. For the Divine Logos is purely spiritual : and therefore the image of spirit is seen in man alone, and the good man is in soul like God and divinely formed, and God again is like man, for the characteristic form of each is spirit.² To the Gnostic of Clement the whole essence of Christianity is contained in the idea of the Logos. Like the primal being of the Gnostics, the absolute God, as he abstractly is in himself, is simply unknowable. With respect to this absolute God, the Logos alone is the mediating principle, through which the idea of the Absolute becomes realised in the Gnostic, theoretically and practically. But the substance of Christianity consists so solely of the idea of the Logos, that with Clement as with the Gnostics, its historical character is lost in Docetism. The Gnostic Christ belongs so completely to the world of Aeons that he cannot come into any immediate contact with the material world of sense ; and so the Logos of Clement is far too exalted and transcendental to enter into the full reality of a truly human existence. Clement himself expressed his Docetism almost without disguise, when he went so far as to say of the human manifestation of Christ that the Logos assumed the mask of a man, and fashioning himself figuratively in flesh, enacted the drama of human salvation.³ He did not share the dualism of the Gnostics, and therefore could not agree with them in their separation of the Creator from the highest God. The form of Gnosticism most congenial to him was the monotheism set forth in the Homilies. He too identified Judaism and Christianity ; not however as the Homilies did, by supposing spurious additions in the books of the Old Testament, but in true Alexandrian fashion, by means of allegorical interpretation, of which Clement and Origen made the most extensive use. The most important point

¹ Strom. i. 13.² Ib. vi. 9.³ Cl. ad Gent. cap. 10.

is with Clement the interpretation of Scripture received from the Lord, or the church canon of the accordance and harmony of the Law and the Prophets with the Testament given through the manifestation of the Lord.¹ The task of allegory is therefore to prove the perfect identity of the Old and New Testaments. And it performs the task so completely, that Christianity is shown to be virtually nothing but Judaism with the veil removed. As allegory is never supposed to be merely arbitrary and subjective, Clement regarded it as something traditional; and as the Gnostics were wont to refer to a definite authority, whence they claimed to have received their tenets as a private doctrine, so Clement also appealed to his authorities, from whose hands, as he professed, his Gnosticism, consisting mainly in an inquiry after the allegorical sense of Scripture, had reached him by secret tradition.² When we see that the points of contact between Gnosticism and the Alexandrian doctrine are so many, we must attach all the more importance to the fact that, in contrast to Gnostic fatalism and naturalism, Clement and Origen firmly maintained the principle of the freedom of the will, as put forth in moral effort.

The idea of freedom affords a suitable occasion for passing from Clement to Origen. This idea gives a fresh proof how deep was the affinity between Alexandrian and Gnostic thought; and how this age, when it aimed at stating its views not in detached fragments of various subject and character such as the *Stromata*, but in the unity of a finished whole, could do no other than advance a system analogous to those of Gnosticism. In the system of Origen everything depends on the conception of freedom. Freedom is the principle of morality. Origen then does not proceed from the metaphysical standpoint, like the Gnostics; it is from morality that he set out. Notwithstanding this, however, his system follows the same process as those of the Gnostics. To avoid all infringement on the idea of moral goodness, he assumed that the spirits created by God were at first exactly alike in the possession of the same freedom of the will for good and evil.

¹ *Strom.* vi. 15.² *Ib.* i. 1.

Every distinction in the world springs from freedom, and the different use made of it. The material world itself originated in accordance with the previous results of the freedom possessed by the spiritual beings in the higher world. To suppose the principle of freedom is not only to suppose the possibility of evil, but to take away the need for any further exposition of the real existence of evil. The chief factor in the development of Origen's system, therefore, as in that of the Gnostics, is the Platonic idea of a fall of spiritual beings from the higher world into the material world. The whole origin and organisation of the world, however, is conditioned by the idea of moral good and evil, which rests on the principle of freedom. In Origen's moral view of the world, the material world is to be considered as a place of punishment for fallen spirits, who are placed, in their material vesture, each in that position in the universe which it has deserved by its moral behaviour in the intellectual world. But there is a recovery as well as a fall; and upon the same beginning there ever follows, in the principle of freedom, the same possibility of the consequences which flow from it; and therefore there is an infinite succession of finite worlds in the continuous alternation of fall and recovery. God himself, thus considered, is only the idea of the moral order which is immanent in the world; and this order is the dispensation of definite consequences, conditioned by the righteousness of God, to good and evil deeds according to their moral nature. Thus alone the infinite variety of intelligent beings, who diverge in their freedom in such different directions, is brought to an inner unity, and to an order which compacts them and knits them into one.

Spirit and matter stand with Origen in a different relation to each other from that of the Gnostics; still with him God alone is pure immaterial spirit in an absolute sense; in the fallen spirits, in whom the fire of spirit has grown cold and become soul, the spiritual power, diminished in proportion to the fall, cannot escape the material wrapping and the determining influence of matter. Thus with Origen as well as with the Gnostics everything comes

back ultimately to the antithesis of spirit and matter. In any case, in that doctrine which afterwards proved so offensive to the dogmatic consciousness as the latter came to be more precisely fixed, the pre-existence and fall of souls, we find ourselves in a circle of ideas closely allied to Gnosticism. Here also,—as we may especially see in Origen's Christology, so visibly inclining towards Docetism,—the positive truths of historical Christianity threaten to dissolve into general speculative ideas. Plainly, therefore, no victorious resistance to Gnosticism could ever have proceeded from this quarter.¹

Quite different was the attitude taken up towards Gnosticism by the two Western Doctors, Irenaeus and Tertullian. In them first do we meet with a Christian polemic which attacks the essential character of Gnosticism. But even they did not attain their end in the way of doctrine so much as in the way of church polity. Acute and pertinent as the arguments for the most part were by which the two Doctors sought to refute the doctrines of the Gnostics in detail, and the whole mode of view on which the Gnostic systems were based, still such a polemic as theirs led no further than to a philosophical and dialectical contest, from which no definite result could ever proceed. As Christianity, as the Gnostics apprehended it, lost its original and peculiar character, it became very important to assume a position from which the cause of specific Christian belief could be maintained with all due emphasis. Above all, it must be clearly shown how antagonistic was the tendency of Gnosticism to the general nature of Christianity. Such was the position which Tertullian took up when in his polemic against Marcion he brought out into clearness and prominence what Gnostic Docetism involved. If, he says, Christ in his fleshly manifestation is found to be a lie, it follows that all that came to pass through the flesh of Christ becomes a lie as well: that he was with men and lived with them is all mere illusion. The sufferings of Christ are then no proper object of faith, for he who has not suffered actually has not suffered at all.

¹ Compare *Die Christl. Gnosis*, p. 502 *sq.* *Theol. Jahrb.* 1846, p. 81 *sq.*

Thus the whole work of God is overthrown, and the whole meaning and fruit of Christianity, the death of Christ, the foundation of the Gospel according to the Apostles, is denied.¹ If then Christianity is only what Gnostic opinion deems it to be, it has no objective historical reality; Gnosticism changes the Christian facts into something merely apparent and ideal, something purely subjective. This tendency of Gnosticism, which made it so opposed to the historical character of Christianity, could only be accounted for on the supposition that Gnosticism was a totally different thing from Christianity. Accordingly, it was one of the great points of the polemic of Irenæus and Tertullian against Gnosticism that they held up to view the heathen origin of the Gnostic doctrines. They not only affirmed, but endeavoured to show in detail, that the Gnostics borrowed the whole contents of their systems from the theogonies of the ancient Greek poets and the systems of the philosophers, changing nothing but the names; that if things and not names were taken into account, nothing would be discovered in all their so-called mysterious wisdom that had not been already taught by Thales and Anaxagoras, Heraclitus and Empedocles, Democritus and Epicurus, Pythagoras and Plato. Hence Irenæus presents the result of his demonstration in the form of the following dilemma. Either the heathen poets and philosophers, with whom the Gnostics agree so exactly, knew the truth, or they did not. If they knew it, it was superfluous for the Redeemer to come into the world. If they did not know it, how can the Gnostics boast of such lofty knowledge, when in that knowledge they merely agree with those who know not God?² The course of the controversy made Christians more and more plainly aware of the relation, not merely of Gnosticism, but of Greek philosophy, to Christianity; and it was therefore natural that the attack should be turned against philosophy itself, as the source of Gnosticism.

How different was the judgment passed by these Doctors as

¹ Adv. Marc., iii. 8.

² Compare Die Christl. Gnosis, p. 485 sq., 469 sq.

compared with the Alexandrians, upon the value of philosophy, and in particular by Tertullian, who did not shrink from the extremest expression of his opinion! Philosophy, according to them, was only a contradiction of Christianity—an antithesis that could never be adjusted; and they frankly declared the principle that philosophy and Christianity could have nothing in common with each other. The Alexandrians regarded faith as a mere groundwork and first stage, the starting-point of that progress to knowledge by which alone faith arrives at its completion. Tertullian and Irenæus, on the other hand, were determined to know nothing but simple faith, and repudiated as hurtful to the purity of faith every attempt to go beyond it and advance to knowledge.¹ Philosophy itself had called the various views and opinions which divided its schools and sects “heresies,” and thus provided the name now commonly applied to all systems and articles of doctrine which seemed to be at variance with the Christian consciousness. There was ample justification, it was thought, for calling philosophy the mother of all heresy. As the Christian consciousness, seeking to resist Gnosticism and philosophy, gathered itself together, became fixed, attained a definite perception of its own distinctive nature, laid firm hold upon its own specific principles, and repelled all that was novel or alien, the opposition it put forth became more and more energetic. Yet this was not a method that could lead to any settled result. Argue and contend with their opponents as they might, the orthodox doctors still shared with the other side a field in which the struggle only entered on a new phase. One would have thought that the dispute with the Gnostics as to what was to be counted Christian doctrine and what was not could have been most easily and simply decided by means of the

¹ Tert. de Præscr. Haer. cap. 7. Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? Quid academiae et ecclesiae? Quid haereticis et Christianis? Nostra institutio de porticu Salomonis est, qui et ipse tradiderat, Dominum in simplicitate cordis esse quaerendum. Viderint qui Stoicum et Platicum et dialecticum Christianismum protulerunt. Nobis curiositate opus non est post Jesum Christum, nec inquisitione post evangelium. Cum credimus, nihil desideramus ultra credere. Hoc enim prius credimus, non esse quod ultra credere debemus.

apostolic books recognised on both sides. But the opponents of the doctors, though they did not reject the authority of these books, restricted it in various ways; for it followed from their general distinction of different principles, that they could not look upon every part of the Scriptures as equally divine and equally credible. And it was still more natural that, even where the parties were agreed about the books as a whole, there should be very different opinions as to their sense. Here again, accordingly, as each side interpreted the books in its own way, there was merely opinion against opinion. Each side claiming with equal right the support of Scripture, the dispute could only be decided by some other principle standing above the sacred books. What principle was this to be?

It was at this point of the development of the Catholic Church, now first rising to the consciousness of its idea, that a new and most important step was taken. It was in the contest with Gnosticism that tradition was first placed in that relation to Scripture which it has ever since maintained in the doctrinal system of the Catholic Church. At a time when the canon of the writings held to be apostolic was still extremely unsettled, the whole fabric of Christianity rested on tradition. But what tradition was in its notion and principle, this was not learned till opponents of a peculiar kind had to be dealt with,—opponents who could not be rebutted without founding upon something that was nearer the source than Scripture, and stood above the authority of Scripture. The inmost essence of the question is disclosed to us when we see that Tertullian—in this particular matter much the greatest champion of the Catholic Church—arrived at the conclusion, “*Ergo non ad Scripturas provocandum est.*” Experience had doubtless shown him again and again how utterly inconclusive was any controversy conducted on the basis of Scripture alone. An arena was not to be resorted to where, even at the best, victory ever remained doubtful. Even if in such a controversy (thinks Tertullian) the two sides are equally balanced, still the nature of the subject-matter requires that first of all certain questions should be asked :

who holds the true faith? to whom does Scripture belong? from whom, through whom, and to whom, was delivered the doctrine that makes men Christians? Where truth of doctrine and of Christian belief is found to exist, there also will be found the truth of Scripture, and of the interpretation of Scripture, and of all Christian traditions.¹ Now, to reach the one point from which the whole truth of Christianity depends, we have clearly to retrace the path by which Christianity has come down to us. The first preacher of Christian truth is Christ, after him the apostles; and their name—*apostoli* or *missi*—expresses the principle by which we are to abide. Christ having sent out the apostles to preach, no other preachers may be acknowledged than those instituted by him. For none know the Father save the Son, and him to whom the Son reveals him; now he has revealed him only to the apostles, whom he sent out to preach that which he revealed to them. What they preached, what Christ revealed to them, can be known in no other way than through the churches founded by the apostles, through the living word of their preaching, and the epistles, which they afterwards added to that oral instruction. If this be the case, then it is unquestionable that the doctrine which agrees with the belief of the original parent-congregations founded by the apostles is to be taken as the truth, since it undoubtedly comprises what the churches received from the apostles, the apostles from Christ, and Christ from God. Every other doctrine must of necessity be false, since it is opposed to the truth of the churches, of the apostles, of Christ, and of God. The evidence or criterion of truth is therefore apostolic tradition, or conformity to the doctrine of the apostolic churches.² We have here all the elements required to form the idea of tradition. The function of tradition, according to its proper idea, is to mediate. It moves between two more or less distant points, offering to the mind a mediating link between the past and the present. If it is to testify to the truth of Christian

¹ De Praescr. Haereticorum, c. 19.

² De Praescr. Haeret. c. 21. Communicamus cum ecclesiis apostolicis, quod nulla doctrina diversa, hoc est testimonium veritatis.

doctrine, it must be capable of showing with certainty that the doctrine deemed Christian by a later age is one and the same with the original doctrine of Christ. It is obvious that the true Christian doctrine can be no other than that which was proclaimed by Christ, and handed on by the apostles; but what doctrine is that which was handed down by the apostles and proclaimed by Christ? To answer this, we must not merely look to the beginning—though no doubt all is referred back to the beginning, since (as Tertullian says) “*omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necesse est*,” nor merely to what has since intervened; there is a third requisite, viz., that our inquiry should proceed from the one point from which alone proceeds a path that will lead us to original Christian truth. This is Tertullian’s argument when he refers to the apostolic churches as those which contain the true doctrine of Christ. But since there is not only one apostolic Church, but many, only that doctrine in which all of them agree can be regarded as the true doctrine.¹ We have thus three momenta, each of which is an essential factor in the notion of tradition: viz., origin from Christ, transmission through the apostles, consensus of the churches. Each of these points presupposes the two others: without the agreement of the churches, we cannot tell from what first point we should set out; without the origin from Christ, the whole has no unity of principle; without the transmission by the apostles, the present cannot form a continuous whole with the past. The three elements together give to Christian doctrine, in so far as it rests on tradition, the character of objective truth. It is inherent in the idea of tradition that it is a thing given—that it is originally imparted by Divine revelation. Whatever disagrees with it, whatever deviates more or less from it, is therefore merely a subjective opinion, a product of

¹ This agreement is the criterion of their common Apostolic origin:—*Omnes primæ et omnes apostolicæ, dum una omnes probant unitate communicatio pacis et appellatio fraternitatis et contesseratio hospitalitatis, quæ jura non alia ratio regit, quam ejusdem sacramenti una traditio.* Tert. de Praescr. Haer. cap. 20. Comp. cap. 28: *quod apud multos unum invenitur, non est erratum sed traditum.*

human self-will, or a heresy. Those are heretics who stand opposed as individuals to a majority held to be catholic; who esteem their self-made or self-chosen truth more highly than the objective truth of the catholic doctrine.¹ The catholic antithesis to heresy consists in an agreement of doctrine that excludes all arbitrary variety of opinion. In order to a clear apprehension of this agreement, those doctrines which were to be regarded as the main expression of the common conviction were summed up in short propositions, which declared positively that which the antithesis of the adversaries denied. These are the *regulae fidei*, to which even Irenaeus and Tertullian appealed in their refutation of the Gnostics. They represent the first attempts to fix doctrinal conceptions in symbols, and were called forth, like the later formulas, by the attacks of adversaries.² It is the second of the above-mentioned three elements of tradition which, standing as a link between the other two, connects them and draws them together. It is therefore the most important of the three, and constitutes the proper region in which tradition moves. Only by transmission through the apostles could the truth that came forth from Christ come to be the accordant doctrine of all the Christian churches. The apostles, however, are merely the men who delivered the doctrine of Christ; they are but the first members of a series that ever increases in length with the process of time. Thus, though the apostolic foundation of the churches is a matter of the utmost importance, yet it is not less important to know who were the successors of the first founders, and whether the other members of the series handed on the doctrine of Christ as genuine and unadulterated as they had received it from the hands of the apostles. The Gnostics threw doubt even on the traditional authority of the apostles; they asserted that the apostles themselves did not know everything; or if they did, still they did not impart everything to

¹ De Praescr. Haer. cap. 37. Haeretici-Christiani esse non possunt, non a Christo habendo, quod de sua electione sectali haeticorum nomine admittunt.

² Iren. i. 10; iii. 4. Tert. de Praescr. Haer. c. 13. Adv. Prax. c. 2. De virg. vel. 1.

all. And here they appealed to the contention between Peter and Paul, recorded in the Epistle to the Galatians, and the stern words of blame addressed by Paul to Peter himself respecting his doctrine.¹ And the proof by tradition could not but become less trustworthy as the connecting links in the transmitting series increased in number. But notwithstanding, and even on account of, this uncertainty, the doctors ascribed the highest importance to the fact, which they maintained emphatically, that only among themselves was it possible to point to an unbroken succession of men who had faithfully guarded the doctrine delivered by the apostles.² The bishops are the successors of the apostles; and as such they are the depositaries of the apostolic tradition. The episcopate has accordingly the same significance as tradition in the history of the Catholic Church. Tradition is the substantial element of the Catholic Church, the principle which, however widely the Church expands, preserves its apostolicity and unity: but it is from the episcopate alone that tradition derives its concrete reality. Accordingly, the further history of the Catholic Church is to be traced in connection with the idea of the episcopate, the origin and peculiar nature of which must be understood before we can follow the course of that history. We shall see that the case was the same with regard to the episcopate as with regard to tradition. That same need for unity which, in opposition to Gnosticism, called forth the idea of the Catholic Church, and realised it in the form of tradition, continued to operate in the episcopate, through which the Catholic Church first acquired its firm consistency.

¹ De Praescr. Haer. c. 22.

² De Praescr. Haer. c. 32: Edant origines ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successionem ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum apostolis perseveravit, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. Hoc enim modo ecclesiae apostolicae census suos deferunt, sicut Smyrnaeorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Johanne collocatum refert, sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum itidem. Perinde utique et ceterae exhibent, quos ob apostolis in episcopatum constitutos apostolici seminis traduces habeant. Comp. cap. 36; Iren. adv. Haer. iii. 2, 2; iii. 3, 1, 2; iv. 26, 2.

2. THE HIERARCHICAL ANTITHESIS.

IF we could consider the bishops to be the successors of the apostles, in the sense in which Church tradition affirms their succession, the question concerning the origin of the episcopate would admit of a very simple solution. But the bishops were certainly not the immediate successors of the apostles, and before there were *ἐπίσκοποι* in the technical sense, there were the *πρεσβύτεροι* and *διάκονοι*. The statements contained in the Acts of the Apostles seem to pre-suppose, as a matter of course, that in addition to the apostles there were also presbyters at the head of the first Christian churches, after the analogy of the Jewish synagogue. In the case of the Church of Jerusalem, we are only told that when a special administration of alms became necessary, there were appointed *διάκονοι*, chosen, in accordance with a proposal made by the apostles, to discharge that function (vi. 1). This church therefore already possessed presbyters; and in the case of the churches abroad, we read of the appointment of presbyters as the first measure taken by the apostles in arranging for their being carried on (xiv. 23). It is very natural to assume that when the apostles founded a Christian Church, they also settled the first arrangements required for its organisation. Still—even if we are in no danger of thinking that the whole constitution of the Church must have been of apostolic institution—we cannot too carefully guard against admitting more pre-suppositions than the nature of the question allows. When we consider how weak the first beginnings of the earliest churches were, and of how few members they consisted, we see that, even had the founders conceived a complete plan of organisation, their choice must have been extremely limited in making their arrangements. In its earliest stage a church might consist only of a few families, or perhaps only of one; and it was a natural consequence that the

family, which served as the main stem for the grafting on of fresh members, should gain a preponderating influence, and guide the movements of the general body. These are the ἀπαρχαὶ, mentioned in the First Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (cap. 42), and not only there, but also in the First Epistle of the apostle Paul to the Corinthian Church (xvi. 15, 16). When the apostles proclaimed the Gospel in the country districts and the towns, they appointed, says Clement, their firstlings (ἀπαρχὰς), i.e. those who first received the Christian faith, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν. The ἐπίσκοποι are here placed side by side with the διάκονοι; in the same way, in the Epistle to the Philippians (i. 1), the heads of the Church are called ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι; and in general, the ἐπίσκοποι, where we first meet them, since like the διάκονοι and πρεσβύτεροι¹ they are spoken of in the plural, must be equivalent to the πρεσβύτεροι. The two names denote the same persons, according as they are regarded as the heads and representatives of the congregation, or as the overseers who watch over the whole body. While the ἐπίσκοποι then coincide with the πρεσβύτεροι, the διακονία seems to contain the original form of the Christian ministry. The apostles, according to Clement, appointed the firstlings rather for those who should believe in the future than for those who already believed. Here it might seem that no more is meant than a διακονία, in that sense in which the apostle Paul reports, with approval of the house of Stephanas, the ἀπαρχὴ of Achaia, that they have undertaken the διακονία for the Christians. But on the other hand we have to consider that in the epistle of Clement of Rome the διάκονοι are mentioned side by side with the ἐπίσκοποι. If then the διακονία of which the apostle speaks involves any leading of the congregation, it can refer to no more than those simple wants which would be felt first when the congregation was coming into existence and form. The apostle's exhortation to obedience towards those who perform the διακονία furnishes a probability that the word is to be so understood. The

¹ Compare Acts xx. 17, 28; Tit. i. 5, 7; 1 Tim. iii. 1-8; 1 Peter v. 2, 3.

term itself may mean any service done for the congregation :¹ the word was not unfit to describe the general leadership of a congregation, inasmuch as, during the first stage of the growth of the society, the firstlings were obliged to undertake various exertions which could hardly be looked upon in any other light than as a performance of service for others. But when we find the *διάκονοι* contrasted with the *ἐπίσκοποι*, the original ministry has developed two distinct but essentially connected sides. On the one hand we have the superintending authority, watching over the whole society, and providing it with a centre ; while the other sphere of official activity includes inferior services of various sorts, especially those relating to internal economy and the support of the needy. From the latter functions the *διάκονοι* derive their special name, and thus the *διάκονοι* necessarily stood in a subordinate relation to the *ἐπίσκοποι*.² The *ἐπίσκοποι* and *διάκονοι* of Clement of Rome thus furnish the original idea of the Christian ministry, as essentially consisting of these two parts ; but the supposition that the apostles themselves appointed the *ἐπισκόπους* and *διακόνους*, in order to give the congregations from the first a definite organisation by means of these standing offices, can only have arisen from the opinions and modes of view of a later age. In a question concerning the foundation of Christian societies, the conduct of Paul must be considered first of all. Let us suppose that, when he founded a church, he thought it indispensable to appoint a standing ministry ; such, in fact, is the account given in Acts xiv. 23, with regard to the first church which he founded. Some trace of the existence of these ministries would then certainly be found in the genuine epistles ; when, prescribing rules, censuring disorders, or inviting contributions, he would have manifold occasion to address himself to the bishops and deacons. Now it is true that in the series of gifts which he enumerates, and with respect to

¹ It is used of the office of the apostles, Acts i. 17, 25 ; xx. 24 ; xxi. 19 ; Rom. xi. 13. Eusebius, E. H. v. i. *διακονία τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς*.

² Therefore Cyprian reminds the deacons that the apostles "*diaconos sibi constituerunt episcopatus sui et ecclesiae ministros.*"

which he regards various personal qualities as specially fitting their possessors for the various functions and services connected with the organic life of the church, he speaks of a *διακονία*, Rom. xii. 7, of *ἀντιλήψεις* and *κυβερνήσεις*, 1 Cor. xii. 28; and it is possible to recognise in these terms an abstract expression for the concrete names of *διάκονοι* and *ἐπίσκοποι*. But no indication of a standing formal office appears; indeed the *διακονία* of the firstlings of Achaia is spoken of merely as a service voluntarily undertaken. It is not till we come to the later canonical books and the epistle of Clement of Rome (which falls under the same category), that we meet the ministries of the *ἐπίσκοποι* and *διάκονοι*; it is evidently merely a wish to give to the congregational constitution which existed in his time the sanction of apostolic authority which leads Clement to say, cap. 44, that the apostles knew that there would be strife concerning the name of the *ἐπισκοπή*. For this reason, he says, in their perfect foreknowledge, they instituted bishops and deacons, and afterwards issued a supplementary ordinance,¹ that after their death other tried men should succeed them in their ministry. Those who had been instituted at first by the apostles, or afterwards by other notable men, with the approval of the whole congregation, and had blamelessly performed their service to the Lord's flock, could not, it is urged, be justly removed from their ministry (their *λειτουργία*, or, as it is called directly afterwards, the *ἐπισκοπή*, i.e. the office of the *πρεσβύτεροι*.) According to this, both the *ἐλλόγιοι ἄνδρες* and the *πᾶσα ἐκκλησία* took part in the elections to the church offices. The more influential members of the congregation conducted the election, and proposed the names, which were accepted only if the congregation assented. Since those called "notables" are not clerical persons, it is still the congregation with whom the right of election rests; and the original conception to which these first beginnings of the

¹ This is undoubtedly the meaning of the word *ἐπινομή*. Compare Lipsius, de Clementis Rom. Epist. ad Cor. priore disquisitio. Lips., 1853, p. 20 sq. Even such a matter of course as the intention that these offices should be continued in the future could not be imagined without a special apostolic ordinance.

whole future hierarchy lead us back is unquestionably congregational self-government. This self-government is recognised in the Acts of the Apostles, where, in an election (that of the first deacons), which takes place at the invitation of the apostles, the co-operation of the collective number of the disciples is necessary. It is presupposed by Paul; he can only complete an intended excommunication, 1 Cor. v. 3, with the consent of the congregation; and in like manner, with regard to the reconciliation and restoration of the offender, he makes his decision to depend entirely on that of the congregation, 2 Cor. ii. 5 *sq.*

A proof that self-government was originally an essential characteristic of the Christian congregations is seen in the fact that it still existed uncontested in the form of congregational universal suffrage at the time when Cyprian, the Bishop of Carthage, represented the clergy in the full consciousness of their rights.¹ Even the functions afterwards discharged by the clergy alone in virtue of their specific official character were not at first assigned exclusively to the persons at the head of the congregations; it was not in distinction from the other members, but only through them, that they came to do these acts. What at a later time were exceptions attest the universal practice of the early Church. Paul supposes a universal right of teaching when he denies it to women alone, 1 Cor. xiv. 34. But he says also, xii. 28, that God appointed in the Church first apostles, then prophets, thirdly teachers; and thus speaks of the teachers as a class by themselves. The author of the Epistle of James only asks that there be not too many teachers, iii. 1, *sq.*; in the Epistle to the Hebrews, xiii. 7, the readers are admonished to remember the leading men as those who have uttered to them the *λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*; and in the Epistle to the Ephesians, iv. 11, after the apostles, the prophets, the evan-

¹ He writes, Ep. 32, to the presbyters, deacons, and the universa plebs: In ordinationibus clericis solemus vos ante consulere, et mores ac merita singulorum communi iudicio ponderare. In Ep. 67 he says of the plebs itself that it "ipsa maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes, vel malignos recusandi."

gelists, and the pastors, we find teachers also mentioned. In the Shepherd of Hermas,¹ where *episcopi*, *doctores*, and *ministri* are mentioned together with the apostles, the word *doctores* certainly does not signify the presbyters as distinguished from the bishops: but the *episcopi*, who are not distinguished from the presbyters, are merely placed first because (as in the case of the *προεστῶς*, Justin's Apolog. i. 67), they combine the office of teaching and that of superintendence; and this is not inconsistent with the existence of other *doctores* also. If we take all the evidence together, it is clear that the work of active teaching, though annexed to the ministry of the Church, was not exclusively attached to it. In later times, therefore, the right to teach could not be absolutely denied to the laity; it was merely required that when they taught they should deliver their discourses in the presence and with the approval of the bishops.² Nor, again, do the primitive regulations concerning baptism and the Lord's Supper exhibit any trace of the later specific distinction between clergy and laity. It is true that, according to Tertullian,³ the right to baptise belonged to the priest highest in rank, that is, to the bishop, and after him, though not without the bishop's approval, to the presbyters and deacons. But the same right, it was affirmed, belonged to the laity also, since what was received *ex aequo* could also be given *ex aequo*: only, they should not use it except in cases of necessity. So with the Lord's Supper; it was the custom of Christendom that only the president dispensed it, as, according to Justin, it is the *προεστῶς* who blesses the bread and wine; but, asks Tertullian, are not the laity also priests? Where only three are gathered together, though they be all laymen, there is the Church.⁴ Thus all that the clergy afterwards claimed especially to be, all that they regarded as their peculiar

¹ Vis. iii. 5. In the Greek text, known to us through Simonides, we find only *ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διδάσκαλοι*, without the *ministri*. But immediately after come, in the following order, *ἐπισκοπήσαντες καὶ διδάξαντες καὶ διακονήσαντες*. Dressel, Patr. Apost. Opera., Lips., 1857, p. 579.

² Cp. what is related by Eusebius concerning Origen, E. H. vi. 19.

³ De baptism., cap. 17.

⁴ De exhort. castit.

attribute, was claimed by Tertullian for the laity as a universal right of Christian priesthood.¹

But though the original spirit of congregational autonomy was still vigorous in the congregations of this period, and asserted itself as of old even where it could no longer be put in practice, yet already there had arisen a special class of ecclesiastical persons, whose official activity comprised all functions relating to the congregations as a whole, and the congregation had thus become divided into two distinct orders. Clergy and laity (*laici*), or the *ordo* and the *plebs*, stood over against each other under those distinctive names; but it is remarkable that even this division was originally quite free from any hierarchical notions.² Though the above-mentioned terms convey a definite distinction, yet, as Tertul-

¹ Ritschl proves (1st ed., p. 367; 2d ed., p. 347, *sq.*) with very minute detail that the congregational officials, according to the original view of their relation to the congregation, did not hold, as distinguished from the latter, any special religious or priestly character. This applies also to the power of forgiving sins, to the laying on of hands in baptism, and to the absolution of the lapsed.

² The case would be otherwise if, as Jerome says (Ep. 52) the clergy were so named with reference to Deut. x. 9, xviii. 2, because they *de sorte sunt domini*, or because *dominus ipse sors, i.e. pars clericorum est*. Neander questioned this interpretation, on the ground that it seems inconsistent with the historical usage of the word *κλήρος*; but his own explanation erred by making too much of the notion of "lot" in the word. In my essay, *Ueber den Ursprung des Episcopats* (1838, p. 93, *sq.*), I have pointed out that in the letter of the churches of Lugdunum and Vienna, in Eusebius (E. H. v. 1), where a *κλήρος μαρτύρων* is spoken of, and in some passages in the Ignatian Epistles, the word *κλήρος* seems to mean a class, and particularly a high class. Ritschl shows this more minutely (1st ed. 398, *sq.*, 2d ed. 390). *Κλήρος* means degree, rank, as where (Eusebius, E. H. iv. 5) it is said of the sixth bishop of Alexandria, *τὴν προστασίαν ἕκτῳ κλήρῳ διαδέχεται*. *Κλήρος* is equivalent to *τάξις*. Now there is also a distinction of *κλήροι* within the Christian ministry, and here *κλήροι* are successive offices, successive steps of rank. Thus Irenaeus says (Adv. Haer. iii. 3) of the Roman bishop, Eleutherus, that he held *τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς κλήρον* in the twelfth place from the apostles. *Κλήρος* is here a rank, as even in the Acts (i. 17, 25) the apostolic office is termed *ὁ κλήρος τῆς διακονίας ταύτης*. In the same way we hear of a *κλήρος τῶν μαρτύρων*, a class of martyrs. A whole church too is called *κλήρος*, as when Ignatius wishes that he may be found *ἐν κλήρῳ ἑβρεσίων χριστιανῶν*, who had always been in accordance with the apostles. The Christians of Ephesus had thereby gained precedence before others, and thus here the conception of a higher rank is attached to the word *κλήρος*. The special meaning of the word, its exclusive transference to a particular order—that of ecclesiastical officials—is undoubtedly analogous to the meaning of the expressions "rank," "position,"

lian clearly says,¹ the conception of the clerus still contains nothing that tends to remove the original and essential equality of the two orders. The clergy had only an honorary precedence above the other members of the congregation. They are no doubt by this time considered priests; their *ordo* is not merely the *ordo ecclesiasticus*, but also the *ordo sacerdotalis*; and it is precisely in contrast to the priesthood that the words *λαὸς*, *λαϊκοὶ*, bear their peculiar meaning, since a *λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος*, as defined by Clement of Rome, cap. 40, is one who is neither *ἀρχιερεὺς*, nor *ιερεὺς*, nor Levite. Accordingly, while the *λαὸς* is the congregation of the people of Israel, the *λαϊκοὶ* are those who simply belong to it, without holding any especial place in it. But the existence of the priestly character is not yet supposed to place clergy and laity in a definite antithesis. The laity too are priests, and the offering that makes the priest a priest is only prayer; that is, the prayer of thanksgiving at the Lord's Supper, offered together with the gifts brought by the congregation.² Thus, notwithstanding the two separate designations, the line separating the two orders would be as yet only a vague and wavering one, and the self-governing character of the congregation would not be by any means effaced. So also

with us. Although every one has a certain rank and position, yet we speak of rank and position chiefly in the case of those who hold a higher place than others in the social scale. The honour which gathered round the standing offices of the Church caused accidental privileges, such as that of martyrdom, to be less thought of, and the clergy, in the original sense, came to be considered, as we say, persons of rank and position. In the passage, 1 Peter v. 3, where the presbyters are admonished *μὴ κατακυριεύειν τῶν κληρῶν*, the *κληροὶ*, which are equivalent to *ποιμνίον*, can only be the various classes or orders which form the congregation—the flock. Here then *κληρος* still has its wider meaning. The narrower one meets us first in the work of Clement of Alexandria: *τίς ὁ σωζόμε. πλούς.* cap. 42, 1, where it is related that the apostle John, going from Ephesus, journeyed round about the country: *ὅπου μὲν ἐπισκόπους καταστήσων, ὅπου δὲ ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ἀρμόσων, ὅπου δὲ κληρῶν ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος σημεινομένων;* i.e. in places where a college existed already, he introduced a member into the existing body of clergy. Tertullian's equivalent for *κληρος* is *ordo*. This word with him is sometimes simply opposed to *plebs*, sometimes is accompanied by the definition *ecclesiasticus* or *sacerdotalis*.

¹ De exhort. cast. c. 7. Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiae auctoritas et honor per ordinis consensum sanctificatus.

² Cf. Ritschl, 1st ed. p. 404 sq., 2d ed. p. 396.

with the distinction of the presbyteri and the episcopi. Even after the latter had become something quite different from the former, both the name episcopi and the thing itself continued to be interchangeable with the name and the function of "presbyteri:" and it was the presbyters in whom the original spirit of congregational self-government longest survived. With Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus the distinction between presbyter and bishop is still merely relative. It is true that Clement speaks of deacon, presbyter, and bishop, as three successive steps in ecclesiastical office. But he distinguishes only two official characters—that of the presbyters and that of the deacons: the work of the presbyters in matters of doctrine and discipline, he says, is concerned with improvement, that of the deacons with serving.¹ Irenaeus often uses the two terms presbyteri and episcopi as exactly equivalent; he argues in the same way with respect to the successiones of the presbyteri and the successiones of the episcopi; he even calls the bishops of Rome *πρεσβύτεροι*, and unhesitatingly gives the office of the presbyters the name *episcopatus*.² In agreement with this we find that no strict line of demarcation subsisted as yet between the functions exercised by the bishop and those of the presbyters. On the one hand, nothing might be done in the congregation against the will of the bishop; baptisms and ordinations could not be performed without his sanction. But, on the other hand, the presbyters also had power to perform both rites, which could scarcely have been the case if any essential distinction between their office and that of the bishop had been conceived to exist. Such appears the relation of the two orders in a canon of the synod of Ancyra, in the year 314. There is reference to the same state of matters in a resolution of the fourth Council of Carthage in 398, which commands that, at the ordination of a presbyter, all the presbyters and the bishop shall together lay their hands on the head of the candidate. This can only have been an ancient custom, derived from the time when presbyters and bishops were on an equality, and the bishop, as compared with

¹ Paedag. iii. 12; Strom. vi. 13, vii. 1.² Adv. Haer. iii. 2, iv. 26.

the presbyters, was only *primus inter pares*. The original equality was maintained longest in the Alexandrian church. Till the time of Bishop Demetrius (190-232), there was in all Egypt only the one bishop of Alexandria, and the twelve presbyters appointed, as was alleged, by Mark the Evangelist, had the right of choosing the bishop or patriarch out of their own number. Bishop Alexander, soon after the beginning of the fourth century, first fully succeeded in bringing the presbyters in Alexandria into the same subordinate relation to the bishops which existed elsewhere.¹

We must place ourselves mentally in the midst of all these circumstances, so illustrative of the original self-governing character of the Christian congregations, if we wish to obtain a correct idea of the importance of the episcopate in reference to the development of the Catholic Church. Self-government did not quite disappear so long as the distinction of the *πρεσβύτεροι* and *ἐπίσκοποι* was merely relative and wavering. The change introduced by the episcopate consisted in this: that the relative distinction passed into one absolute and specific. The presbyters are many in number, but it is essentially inherent in the idea of the bishop that the bishop is only one. As the one, the one in himself, he is something essentially different from the presbyters, who are what they are only as a plurality taken together. The question has been stated as turning upon the distinction between the congregational office and the church office.² If the bishop too is but a

¹ Ritschl, 1st ed. p. 431 *sq.*, 2d ed. p. 419. The question as to the origin of the episcopate, which in the above citations also appears in Alexandria as the original form of congregational constitution, is answered by Ritschl, p. 434, by a reference to Jerusalem. According to Ritschl, the institution of a bishop and twelve presbyters appointed, it is said, Rec. iii. 66, vi. 15; Hom. xi. 36, in Caesarea and Tripolis by the Peter of the Ebionites, is paralleled by the relation of the twelve apostles to the Lord. This relation was afterwards applied to the constitution of the Jerusalemic congregations: Hegesippus states (Eusebius, E. H. ii. 23) that James, as standing in the place of the Lord, undertook with the apostles the guidance of the congregation. This peculiar Jewish-Christian episcopate is to be distinguished from the Gentile-Christian, which was developed out of the office of presbyter.

² Rothe: *die Anfänge der christlichen Kirche und ihre Verfassung*. Wittenberg, 1837, p. 153 *sq.*

congregational official, then he is merely that which the presbyter is, placed in a higher degree. If then a specific distinction does exist, it can only be found in the fact that the idea of a bishop is not fully expressed in and exhausted by the relation that he bears to the single congregation over which he presides: that the bishop in that relation is conceived as also representing the Church in general, as an organ of the unity and authority of the Church as a whole. Since the relation of the Church to the congregation is that of the universal to the particular, the question is this, Whether the universal is determined by the particular, or the particular by the universal. If we start from the self-government of the congregations, then we find the congregation summed up in the presbyters and bishops, as its representatives, in whom its unity is set forth. The latter are thus, as it were, only an abstraction from the undetermined number of the individuals who together compose the congregation. In them, as the representatives and organs of the congregation, we merely find, in a new form of presentation, that which the congregation itself is. They are nothing without it; they are what they are only through it. But, having begun by proceeding from the many to the one, from the particular to the universal, we find that the relation of the one to the other is capable of turning round so as to become the very opposite. The one is now not a mere abstraction from the many: on the contrary, the many is determined by the one, the particular by the universal. Such is the relation which the bishop, in the proper sense, as not merely relatively, but absolutely and specifically, distinct from the presbyters, holds to the congregation. The latter is appendant to the bishop, as to its head, and is what it is only through him. It is only when we state the question thus that it can be said to turn on the distinction between the congregational and the church offices. If the Church in general, and not the individual congregation, is beheld in the bishop, then it is the Church in its relation to the congregation, which, as universal, as the source of principle, determines the latter. The question for our investigation is, therefore,—what brought about the change and reversal by which the

bishops, instead of standing on one line with the presbyters, as hitherto, rose so far above them and the congregation that the congregations lost their self-governing character, and came to stand in a position of simple dependence on the bishops?¹

The cause of the change lay in the tendency to unity which was a necessary part of the idea of the Church. As the presbyters represented in their own persons the congregations, so among the presbyters the need necessarily came to be felt that one from among themselves should represent the rest, and stand at the head of the whole. But where there was this tendency to find a representative head and centre for the whole institution, it was inevitable that the unity to which all was concentrated should at last gain absolute preponderance, and bring all else into subordination and dependence to itself. Further, every congregation,—like

¹ Here is a point from which different views may diverge. According to Rothe (in the above-mentioned work) the episcopate is a direct institution of the apostles. In order that the power of the keys, the peculiar and complete authority, the sovereign governing power, the divine right, with which the apostles presided over the Church, might not disappear at their death, those of them who were alive after the year 70 made arrangements for the organisation of a Christian Church, which in the Ignatian Epistles appears in full existence (p. 354 *sq.*). The historical data on which Rothe depends for the support of his position are so evidently deficient in all probative force, that they need not be considered any further: cp. against his view my essay *Ueber den Ursprung des Episcopats*, Tüb. 1838, and Ritschl, 1st ed. 423 *sq.*, 2d ed. 410 *sq.* The key of Rothe's position is his opinion as to the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles. Ritschl also considers these epistles to be genuine: but only in the Syrian text. They therefore serve him only in a very limited sense; he dates the origin of the episcopate as far back as the beginning of the second century. In the Epistle to the Romans, cap. 2 (Ritschl argues) Ignatius terms himself bishop; so in the Epistle to the Ephesians, cap. 1, he calls Onesimus their bishop; in the Epistle to Polycarp, "the bishop of the church of the Smyrnaeans," he distinguishes Polycarp clearly from the presbyters and deacons, cap. 6. The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians warrants us in affirming the existence of the same form of constitution in the congregation of Smyrna, about the middle of the second century. Ignatius only knows the episcopate, however, as a congregational, not as a church office. The monarchical episcopate thus existed in its acknowledged rights, at the beginning of the second century, at Antioch, Ephesus, and Smyrna, with attributes however which show it to have been a congregational office only, and bearing a relation to the congregation entirely similar to that set forth by Clement of Rome (Ritschl, 2d ed. p. 402 *sq.*). Upon the doubts as to the genuineness of the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians see Hilgenfeld, *die apost. Väter*, p. 271 *sq.*

the Church in general, to which the individual congregation, as a member of the one body, belongs—has its principle of unity in Christ. Now the more vividly believers became conscious of the relation held by Christ to the whole body of the Church, and to each individual congregation, the more directly were they impelled to set forth externally that relation to the one Lord of the Church, by means of a representative placed at the head of each body, in whom, as it were, the congregations beheld Christ himself and his relation to their body.

It is not without reason therefore that the angels, to whom the Epistles to the seven Churches of the Apocalypse are addressed, have been regarded as an expression of the idea of the episcopate. As they are seven in number the Church general is represented as made up of distinct individual congregations. The seven golden candlesticks, Rev. i. 20, are seven congregations, and the seven stars in the right hand of Christ seven angels; thus it is part of the notion of a congregation that it should have an angel. And since the stars, answering to the seven angels, are all together in the hand of Christ, and so have their unity in him, the angels of the congregations can only be meant to express the relation which binds each individual body to Christ as the one head of all the congregations and the whole Church. In order that the relation of Christ to a community may be conceived as living and intimate, there must be a personal and concrete unity, representing the congregation, by means of which that relation itself may also be contemplated as personal. Through the need of unity, which made the angels of the Apocalypse the ideal representatives of the Churches, and gave that relation such a tangible form in them, in their mediative position between Christ and each Church,—through the same need of unity it was, that such representatives of the same relation came in actual fact to stand at the head of the several bodies, in the persons of the bishops. How strongly the need was felt to have the relation between Christ and the Church set forth in a living person, appears from the position which the James whom we know from the Acts

and the Epistle to the Galatians held with respect to the body of believers at Jerusalem. As the Lord's brother, he was their chief, or, as he is called, at least in the pseudo-Clementine writings, their bishop; and after him Simeon followed in the same position, also because he was a blood-relation of Jesus.¹ Here we have a very plain indication of an endeavour to give as concrete a reality as possible to the bond that joined the congregation to Christ. It is thus plain, that to the mind of Christians something always seemed to be wanting in the congregational organism, unless they saw by immediate observation that the relation between themselves and Christ was maintained by an actual person, viz., by the bishop, as the representative not so much of the congregation as of Christ himself.

But all this would not have been enough to draw forth the bishops so decidedly from their original identity with the presbyters, and to confer upon them what we may call their position of sovereignty as opposed to the presbyters and to the congregation. For this it was needed that circumstances should arise, which should give that endeavour after unity such a fulness of energy and such a practical importance as it had not possessed before. It is beyond doubt, that when the heresies threatened the Christian community with their continual encroachments and their continual tendency to dissolve unity, the episcopate, in the more definite form which it assumed in the course of the second century, acted as a counterpoise to the danger. The great movement occasioned by Gnosticism not only woke to consciousness the idea of the Catholic Church, but was followed by another equally important result; it called forth a counter-action, and this counter-action could find its special aim and end only in the episcopate. It was the episcopate which not only, in opposition to the eccentric, vaguely-straying, dissolving, and decomposing tendency of the heresies, established a firm central point which held all together, and drew to itself all allied elements, but also taught Christians, instead of adapting their frame of mind to the transcendental

¹ Euseb. E. H. iii. 11.

supernatural world, to stand on the firm ground of historical reality and present wants. It was the episcopate which sought and found an answer to the problem how a Christian church could assume a definite form. It was the episcopate which so cooled and moderated the strained ecstatic temper of millenarian belief, that it more and more gave place to a rational sense directed to practical objects; which so far reconciled the world and the Christian mind which had fallen out of relations with the world, that Christianity, founded on the broad basis of a Catholic Church, became able to enter on the path of its historical development.

Even in the Pastoral Epistles of the New Testament Canon we see the close connection between the tendencies of the Church, now forming its constitution, and fixing and shaping itself into the episcopate, and the heretical phenomena of the post-apostolic age. The origin of these Epistles is to be placed in a time at which the heretics described in them—who, to judge by the chief traits by which they are characterised, can only be taken to be the Gnostics of the second century—were attracting much public attention. To combat these heretics is the chief object of all the three Epistles alike. There was nothing that could contribute to check them so effectively as a faithful adherence to the doctrine that had been delivered, and a well-ordered constitution of the congregations under able heads. Accordingly, the Epistles contain a series of monitions and precepts, chiefly referring to church constitution. The oldest of the three, the Second Epistle to Timothy, while it perceives the full magnitude of the evils which threaten the Church through the heretics, confines itself to directions immediately addressed to Timothy himself, to meet the evil to the best of his power.¹ No orders are given respecting the more general regulation of the Christian congregations; only in the admonition of ii. 2 a solicitude of a wider range, including the future in its view, appears. The Epistle to Titus, on the other hand, begins at

¹ Cf. especially, ii. 14 *sq.*, iii. 1 *sq.*, iv. 1 *sq.*, where the great theme of the Epistle is compendiously stated.

once with general instructions referring to the *πρεσβύτεροι* and the *ἐπίσκοποι*, i. 5, and occasioned by the heretics, on account of whose conduct, the Epistle expressly states, these precepts are necessary, i. 10. The circle to whom these prescriptions and reminders is addressed is very large, embracing not merely the presidents of the congregations, but the whole of the members of the Christian community. This is even more the case in the First Epistle to Timothy. In the opening of this Epistle also the heretics are brought forward, and described in very clear terms. From general human relations the writer passes, iii. 1, to those which are ecclesiastical, and says what he thinks needful with regard to the *ἐπίσκοπος*, v. 2, the deacons, v. 8, the *πρεσβύτεροι*, chap. v. 17. Though the episcopate in the stricter sense is not spoken of, the tendency leading to it is very visible. We are enabled to observe very clearly the form which things are beginning to assume, when we find here in the first instance only the general principles according to which the foundation of the constitution of the Christian congregations is to be laid. Though we must not yet suppose a bishop in the later sense to be meant, still it is noteworthy that already the *ἐπίσκοπος* in his unity is distinguished from the plurality of the deacons and *πρεσβύτεροι*, Titus i. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 2.¹

The chief authorities for the history of the development of the episcopal idea are the writings, also pseudonymous, which have come down under the names of Clement of Rome and Ignatius the bishop of Antioch.² Their coincidence in this point is the more

¹ Comp. my work on the Pastoral Epistles, p. 8 sq., 54 sq.

² By the very recent discovery of a Syriac recension of the Epistles of Ignatius, containing only the three Epistles to the Ephesians, the Romans, and Polycarp, a fresh aspect has been given to the much-discussed question of the genuineness of these writings. Those who are unwilling to give them up as authentic remains of a Christian Father, but yet see difficulties in the appearance of so strong a hierarchical tendency at so early an age, as well as in other phenomena of the Epistles, now find their views fully confirmed by the briefness of the Syriac text. On the other hand, the number of those who still defend the genuineness of the seven Greek Epistles continues to decrease. Among the latter is Uhlhorn: das Verhältniss der kürzeren griechischen Recension der Ignatianischen Briefe zur Syrischen Uebersetzung, in Niedner's Zeitschrift für Histor.

remarkable, since the two represent quite different tendencies. Ignatius is a decided Paulinist, while Clement, in the name of his apostle, Peter, acknowledges the strictest Judaism. While they warn against heresies and schisms, and exhibit their danger, they insist no less emphatically on the importance of the episcopate as the Church's sovereign power, representing God and Christ. The fundamental thought which animates both writers alike is, that neither for the individual, nor for the aggregate, is there any salvation but in the unity which ascends to the bishop, to Christ, and to God; that as soon as this union is abandoned, the Christian society is exposed to all the dangers of false doctrine and sin, of the most melancholy division and dismemberment.

Agreement with the bishop is the ever-recurring, the most urgent admonition of the pseudo-Ignatius. Christians must hold to the bishop alone, and do nothing without him, as the Lord did nothing without the Father, but everything in unity with Theol., 1851, part 1; among the former Bunsen, the chief representative of that opinion: Ignatius von Antiochien und seine Zeit, Hamburg, 1847. Die drei ächten und die vier unächten Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochien, Hamburg, 1847. Ritschl, 1st ed. 577 sq.; 2d ed. 402, 453 sq. Lipsius, über die Aechtheit der Syrischen Recension der Ignat. Briefe, in Hilgen's Zeitsch. f. Histor. Theol., 1856, part 1. With regard to the Greek text of the seven Epistles, Lipsius affirms, p. 62, that, considering its views as to the doctrine of Christ, the particular heresies which it combats, and finally, its doctrine of the episcopate, we are compelled to suppose that it dates from a time certainly not earlier than cir. 140; while the Syriac text, in all these respects, shows traces of an earlier origin, and has every claim to be acknowledged as genuine. The consequence of the discovery of the Syriac Epistles in the desert of Nitria (edited by Cureton: The Ancient Syriac Version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, etc., London, 1845, and Corpus Ignatianum, London, 1849), has been that, in proportion as the Epistles in this form are maintained to be genuine, the spuriousness of the Greek Epistles, already so well demonstrated, is placed beyond doubt. To the historian, however, the most important result of the discovery is that in these spurious Epistles he obtains a most significant document for the history of the constitution of the Christian Church in the middle of the second century. If this is established, the question as to the genuineness or spuriousness of the Syriac text is of no very great moment in itself; but it can only be answered in the latter sense. Compare my reply to Bunsen, Tübingen, 1848, and Hilgenfeld, die apost. Vater, p. 187, 274. Lipsius has supplemented his essay, named above, by a further essay, über das Verhältniss des Textes der drei Syrischen Briefe des Ignatius zu den übrigen Recensionen der Ignatianischen Literatur, in the Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Leipz., 1859, p. 1.

him. If we are subject to the bishop, as Christ was to the Father, then we live not after the manner of men, but after the manner of Christ, who died for us, that in belief in his death we might escape death.¹ The command of the Spirit is to do nothing without the bishop, to love union, to flee from schisms, to imitate Christ, as Christ imitates the Father. Especially, no ecclesiastical event may take place without the bishop. The eucharist is not to be deemed duly and validly performed, unless performed by him, or with his sanction. Where the bishop is, there the congregation is, as the Catholic Church is where Christ is. It is not allowed to baptise or to hold an agape without the bishop: only what he approves is pleasing to God; only so can whatever is done be done surely and validly. He who honours the bishop is honoured by God; he that does anything without the knowledge of the bishop serves the devil. He who belongs to God and Christ is also with the bishop. The happiness of those cannot be too highly esteemed, who are as entirely one with the bishop as the Church is one with Christ, and Christ with the Father, to the end that all may accord in unity. He who is not within the altar lacks the bread of God. If the prayer of one or two can avail so much, how much more that of the bishop and the whole congregation? Therefore the bishop may not be resisted; to be subject to God, we must look to the bishop as to the Lord himself, and honour him, as we honour Christ the Son of the Father.² The bishop is therefore even called the substitute of God, the *προκαθημένος εἰς τόπον Θεοῦ*; he that hearkens to him hearkens not to him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ, as the *ἐπίσκοπος πάντων*. He that deceives the bishop deceives not him who is visible, but deceives the Invisible. The visible bishop is in the flesh (*ἐν σαρκὶ ἐπίσκοπος*), in bodily and material fashion, what God or Christ is in invisible spiritual fashion.³ The fundamental idea of the passages relating to the episcopate may there-

¹ Ep. ad Magn. cap. 7; Trall. cap. 2.

² Philad. cap. 3. 7; Smyrn. cap. 8. 9; Eph. cap. 5. 6; Trall. cap. 3.

³ Magn. cap. 6. 3; Eph. cap. 1.

fore be correctly defined thus: "The bishops are essentially the representatives and organs of the unity of the Church, inasmuch as it belongs to the specific character of the episcopate, that they are the immediate representatives, empowered delegates, and organs of God and Christ. In them Christ has, so to speak, multiplied himself; in them he has given himself within the compass of Christendom a universal presence which can be apprehended by the senses. In all the congregations it is he who acts and guides the vital movement through his organ the bishop. Thus in reality it is one and the same person who is at the head of each separate congregation, although his representatives and organs are individually different. And thus all the congregations are joined together in the most intimate and pervading unity, while the condition of that unity is, that there be an organic connection between each community and its bishop."¹

The same fundamental view of a system of ecclesiastical constitution based on the episcopate is contained in the pseudo-Clementine writings. As Mosaism and Christianity are here identified, and both are derived from a primitive revelation and a primitive religion, so the episcopate carries on a tradition which links the unity of the Church to the unity of the human race. Christ is not only the true all-knowing prophet, but also the primal man, who, to reveal the truth, appeared again and again in the patriarchs and in Moses. So now, when he finally appeared, he appointed the twelve apostles to proclaim his words, and his brother James to be bishop of Jerusalem; and James, because of his blood-relationship to the Lord, has the privilege granted to him, that all teachers must be accredited by him. The doctrine of the true prophet, propagated through James and the apostles, is so truly the indwelling principle of the world's development, that Peter, as its representative against Simon Magus, is reckoned, together with Simon, among the syzygies which were predetermined in the world from the beginning. Therefore the bishop, whose ordination makes him a depositary of the true doctrine,

¹ Rothe, *op. cit.* p. 477.

is for his congregation the representative of God and Christ, and on them comes all honour or dishonour done to the bishop. He is thus in his sphere the organ of the one truth. These qualities were attributed to the episcopate by Peter, when he ordained Zacchaeus bishop of Caesarea.¹ In the Homilies the principles of the system are thus further unfolded:²—The Church is compared to a ship in a vehement storm, carrying men from the most various countries, whose master is God, whose pilot is Christ, whose chief oarsman is the bishop, whose passengers are the great body of Christians, and which at last arrives at the wished-for haven of eternal blessedness. It is then necessary above all things that the Church should have a well-ordered constitution. This she cannot have, unless she is ruled by a single ruler; for the cause of the number of wars lies in the number of kings; if there were only one ruler, there would be everlasting peace on earth. Therefore God has appointed one, namely, Christ, to rule over those who are deemed worthy of eternal life. But though Christ is thus the Lord of the Church, it is also necessary that his place be visibly filled; and this is done by the bishop. The bishop takes the place of Christ (*Χριστοῦ τόπον πεπίστευται*): he that offends against him sins against Christ: honour done to him is done to Christ: he has power to bind and to loose. Salvation depends on being connected with him: through him the individual Christian is led to Christ, and from Christ to God: he therefore that shows obedience to the bishop will attain salvation; he that does not, will be punished by God. The duty of the bishop, on the other hand, is to issue no tyrannical commands, like the princes of the Gentiles, but like a father to protect the injured, like a physician to visit the sick, like a shepherd to guard the flock—in a word, to care for the salvation of all. He must not engage in earthly occupations, which belong to the laity; but his whole care must be directed to heavenly things. He has to watch over the welfare

¹ Recogn. iii. 61. Hom. iii. 60.

² Ep. of Clement to James, cap. 14. Hom. iii. 62 sq.

of all, and the preservation of pure doctrine is his peculiar and especial charge. The presbyters follow after the bishop, the deacons after the presbyters; and the centre of the whole community is the bishop of Jerusalem, as the supreme bishop, *ἐπίσκοπος ἐπισκόπων*. To this bishop the charge of doctrine in the whole Church especially belongs, and Peter himself has continually to give an account of his work to him.

If we compare the episcopal idea here unfolded with the form which the constitution of the Christian congregations bears in the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, we shall find the one sufficiently remote from the other. In the circumstances of the Church, as they appear at that early stage, there is no place for a bishop in the sense of the pseudo-Clement and the pseudo-Ignatius; and so entirely is the episcopal idea absent, that even Christ is not called *ἐπίσκοπος*, but only *προστάτης* (cap. 58). But now the idea corresponds to a want of the age, we see the interest which it excited from the emphasis with which the idea, and the whole system of ecclesiastical constitution connected with it, are insisted upon. Two things are especially noteworthy—the fact that the two main tendencies of Christendom, otherwise so distinct, coincide in this point; and the peculiar phenomenon that the writings which labour to carry out the common purpose are pseudonymous. We can see clearly with how deliberate a design, and under how real a need, the path prescribed by the circumstances of the time was followed out. In this pseudonymous literature a peculiar part is played by the same Clement of Rome, to whom, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, the idea of the episcopate is still so strange. As the apostle Peter is the *ἀπαρχὴ* of the Lord, and the first of the apostles, Clement is the *ἀπαρχὴ τῶν σωζομένων ἐθνῶν*, the first of the Gentiles converted by Peter the apostle of the Gentiles.¹ As such, and as the constant companion of the apostle in his missionary journeys, as his most intimate disciple, who had heard all his discourses, and had been instructed by him in the administration of the Church, he is

¹ Ep. Clem. ad Jac. i. 3.

ordained by Peter to be bishop of Rome, and appointed to succeed him in the government of the Christian Church, which, by the missionary activity of the apostle, is extending itself over the Gentile world. All that serves towards the government of the Church is deposited in him: his person supports the whole fabric of ecclesiastical legislation: his name is prefixed to a whole class of writings referring to the same subject. What are we to infer from this but that the constitution of the Christian Church, based on the idea of the episcopate, was of Jewish-Christian origin?¹ While the Jewish-Christians thoroughly approved of the continued expansion of the Christian Church by the conversion of the Gentiles, they were at the same time keenly bent on maintaining its original Jewish-Christian character, by giving it a constitution built on the idea of theocracy and the principle of strict all-pervading unity. Such at least is the clearly pronounced tendency of the pseudo-Clementine writings. Gentile Christianity, as the work of Paul, had no legitimate existence, so long as it lacked the Jewish-Christian imprimatur; and this it first received when Peter was set in the place of Paul as the apostle of the Gentiles. Similarly, the whole constitution of the Church was to be conceived as resting on the authority of Peter and the original congregation of Jerusalem. Only in proportion as the Christian Church holds fast to this original uniting principle is it possible for it—according to the monarchical view on which the pseudo-Clementine books are based—to be preserved in its purity, and to be kept free from all the impure pagan influences that endanger its unity. Although these writings, especially the Homilies, bear the colour of one particular party, still their utterances concerning the constitution of the Church can by no means be taken to proceed from mere partisanship. For the episcopal idea so emphatically asserted in them is the

¹ On the Jewish-Christian origin of the Apostolic Constitutions, and on the position of Clement as the intermediate agent through whom, according to tradition, the Gentile Christians receive the apostolic ordinances destined for them, see my *Essay on the Origin of the Episcopate*, p. 126 *sq.*; Schwegler, *Nachap. Zeit.* i. p. 406 *sq.*; Hilgenfeld, *Die apost. Väter*, p. 302 *sq.*

same which was historically realised in the Catholic Church. The especial support which the party represented in these compositions gave to the Episcopal idea can therefore only show that the constitution of the Catholic Church, based on episcopacy, was of Judaistic origin. The same endeavour after unity is inherent in the original character of Judaism. Or may we not say that it is the same tendency which meets us in Hegesippus, and even in the false apostles, with whom Paul came into hostile contact in so many ways—the tendency to keep ever in view the bond of connection with the original congregation, and to keep a watch over the whole Christian community in the interest of unity and right belief? This tendency after unity is at the same time everywhere an anti-Pauline tendency: this side appears most strongly in the Homilies. In the Pastoral Epistles, on the other hand, and still more in the Epistles of Ignatius, we see Paulinism filled and penetrated by a similar desire for unity. It is this which makes the pseudo-Ignatius, as contrasted with the pseudo-Clement, peculiarly remarkable. A Paulinist, he contends on behalf of the same wants and wishes, whose chief representative is the Petrine pseudo-Clement.¹ The realisation of the episcopal idea was felt to be a need arising out of the circumstances of the age. And so urgent had this need become, that even the Paulinists could now no longer delay to recognise it; only they did not wish to adopt the idea as represented by the Petrine name. For the Jewish Christians, as well as for the Roman Christians, who united Jerusalem and Rome in the person of Clement, Jerusalem was the head and source of all. The Paulinists, on the other hand, turned their eyes back to Antioch, the first seat of Pauline Christianity—where, as the Acts is careful to mention, xi. 26, the disciples were first called Christians in distinction from the Jews—and set up

¹ The author of the Epistles lives in the same idea of unity which possesses the monarchical mind of the author of the Homilies. In the Epistle to the Philad. cap. 8, Ignatius even calls himself a man organised for unity, *ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἔνωσιν κατηρτισμένος*; immediately above, cap. 7, he has cried out *τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις—χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ποιεῖτε—τὴν ἔνωσιν ἀγαπᾶτε*, etc.

against the Petrine Clement the hero of the Jewish Christian tradition, the bishop Ignatius, also one of the personages of the apostolic age. In the bonds of his captivity, in his journey from the East to the West under the escort of Roman soldiers, and in his martyrdom at Rome, the figure of the apostle Paul was to be called up anew before men's minds for the sake of the objects now deemed desirable.¹ In any case, the same fiction is the origin both of the pseudo-Ignatius and of the pseudo-Clement; and we may hence see how completely consistent it was with the spirit of the time, to use such names and such means as have been described in order to introduce principles, institutions, and ideas which had become practically needful.

The highest idea of the episcopate, and the one in which the pseudo-Clement and the pseudo-Ignatius most thoroughly agree, is that of the bishop as the vicar of God and Christ. Now on what does this idea rest, and by what considerations is it sustained? The Homilies merely affirm it, when they say of the bishop, iii. 66, that *ὁ προκαθεζόμενος Χριστοῦ τόπον πεπίστευται*; and the same is the case when in the Epistles, Magn. cap. 6, the *ἐπίσκοπος* is called *εἰς τόπον Θεοῦ προκαθήμενος*. Nor are we brought any further by the words, Eph. cap. 3: Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the will of the Father, as the bishops stationed in various places, *οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὀρισθέντες*, are the will of God, and therefore we must follow the will of the bishop. The same substantial unity which exists between Christ and God is also described as the relation of the bishops to Christ. As then Christ is the personalised will of God, so the bishops are the personalised will of Christ. Such a doctrine rests entirely on the supposition that the idea of unity with Christ necessarily requires it; but since the bishops are in the first instance merely the successors of the apostles, it is in itself a bold transition to see

¹ Cf. my Essay on the Episcopate, p. 179 *sq.* The author of the Epistles exhibits his Paulinism most distinctly in Ephes. 12, where he calls himself a successor of the apostle who was so highly to be extolled on account of his martyrdom. In the Apostolic Constitutions, vii. 46, the apostle Peter is made to say that Evodius had been appointed bishop at Antioch by him, Ignatius by Paul.

directly in the bishop the representative of God and Christ. And if it is their chief task to maintain the unity of the Church in purity of doctrine, and to ward off heresies and schisms, whence have they the doctrine which they are to preserve, if not from the hands of the apostles? It is accordingly noteworthy that the idea—viz., that of the bishop as the vicar of God and Christ—which the pseudonymous books state without showing the links of connection between Christ and the bishops, was not strictly adhered to by the succeeding doctors of the Church. They, on the contrary, brought those connecting links into especial prominence. With Irenaeus and Tertullian the bishops are not the vicars of God and Christ, but only the successors of the apostles, those who uphold and carry on the doctrine delivered by them. Here is a further step in the development of the episcopal idea. Two distinct views are therefore to be distinguished.

The episcopal idea at first did not proceed from the contemplation of the Church in general, but merely grew out of the limited sphere of individual congregations. As long as only presbyters stood, as a plurality, at the head of each body, there seemed to be a lack of a unity fitted to knit and hold all together. Now, as Christ is for each single congregation that which he is for the Church as a whole, it was desired that the ideal unity which each congregation has in Christ should appear as a real unity. This was brought to pass when one man came to stand at the head of the body as the vicar of Christ. First of all, it was necessary to have a bishop as such holding such a representative position; then the unity of the Church might be contemplated as a whole, as shown forth in that which all the bishops were together. But in order that the bishops might show forth this unity, they again must have a real principle of unity in themselves. Such a principle could only be found in the doctrine which they upheld and handed on. By the unity of doctrine in which they all agreed, they were bound together into the real concrete unity of a closely-compacted whole. Now they had received this doctrine, not immediately from Christ, but only through the mediation of the apostles. Therefore, as soon

as the bishops, instead of being merely the points of union for individual congregations, became the representatives of the unity of the Church in general, they could not be conceived as vicars of Christ, but only as successors of the apostles. The transition is already observable in the Homilies, where, though the bishop is the vicar of Christ, he is at the same time the guardian of the truth transmitted by the apostles.¹ The truth delivered by the apostles must be preserved; and therefore, according to the Homilies, the office of bishop is instituted by the apostles, though it is Peter alone who, wherever he founds congregations, also instituted bishops. With the series of doctors that begins with Irenaeus, apostolic succession forms the chief part of the idea of the episcopal office. According to Irenaeus and Tertullian it is the essential function of the bishops to maintain apostolic tradition, and to stand, in the chain of tradition, as links between the past and the future. By their agreement in one and the same doctrine they show forth the unity of the Church. In order therefore to arrive at the principle of unity of doctrine we have only to trace out the episcopal succession.² Cyprian, the chief representative of the episcopal and ecclesiastical sentiment of his age, is still more fully possessed by the idea that unity is embodied and manifested in the episcopate. The Church and the episcopate are to him the same unity. It is the Holy Spirit imparted to the bishops, rather than apostolic succession, that is the principle of the episcopate. The body has its principle of unity in this Spirit; there can be no difference of opinion among those in whom

¹ He is the *προκαθεζόμενος τῆς ἀληθείας*, the *πρεσβύτερος τῆς ἀληθείας*. Ep. Clem. ad Jac. cap. 2, 6, 17.

² The chief passage is in Irenaeus: Adv. Haer. iv. 33: *Γνωσὺς ἀληθείης ἡ τῶν ἀποστόλων διδαχὴ καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς ἐκκλησίας σύστημα κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου et character corporis Christi secundum successionis episcoporum quibus illi eam, quae in unoquoque loco est, ecclesiam tradiderunt.* On this passage, cf. Rothe, "By reason of the transmission of correct doctrine, the episcopal office is held by Irenaeus to be a continuation of the apostolic office, ordained by the apostles themselves; the Church therefore consists in the collective number of such bishops of single congregations as agree with apostolic doctrine." See above, p. 14.

is one and the same spirit.¹ The one Spirit individualises himself in the different bishops. Each bishop is only that which every other is ; in the unity of the episcopate they are altogether one ; they have solidarity together as a whole, in which none stands alone, but each individual exhibits in himself the unity and totality of the whole.² If the bishops are what they are, not as individuals, but only as they thus stand for an aggregate, then no one is either more or less than the rest are : no one may command or take commands from another : each one may consider himself a representative of the aggregate, but may not assume any such position as that of an *episcopus episcoporum*. With Cyprian, however, the need and desire for unity, which are natural to the episcopate, acquire a new significance ; for with him a certain definite point is supposed to be the source of the unity shown forth by the collective number of the bishops. Though the other apostles were also what Peter was, equal associates in honour and power, still the beginning proceeds from unity, in order that the Church of Christ may appear as one ; to Peter, in the first place, the Lord gave the "*potestas, unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit.*"³ With Cyprian, the high pre-eminence which Irenaeus and Tertullian allow only to the Roman Church, on account of its foundation by the two most glorious apostles, passes to the Roman bishop. The Roman Church, as the *cathedra Petri*, is the "*ecclesia principalis unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est.*" If such ideas were accepted, it followed that each of those who, as successors of Peter in the Roman Church, sat in the same *cathedra*, must likewise be regarded as a centre and a uniting point for Christendom ; and this conviction very soon found utterance in the bishops of Rome.⁴ The premises from which the

¹ Ep. 73. 68 (66).

² Ep. 52. *Cum sit a Christo una ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa, item episcopatus unus multorum concordie numerositate diffusus. De Unit. Eccles. cap. 5 : Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.*

³ De Unit. Eccles. cap. 4 ; Ep. 73 (72).

⁴ Even Bishop Firmilian of Cappadocia mentions in a letter to Cyprian (in the *Epistles of Cyprian*, Ep. 75 (74), that the Roman bishop Stephanus "*sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur et se successionem Petri tenere contendit.*"

Papacy was a consistent conclusion are already given. If Peter was the first bishop of Rome, the Roman bishops must be his successors, and accordingly must have the same primacy as he had. Peter was made bishop of Rome because he was believed to have visited Rome; and he was supposed to have been once in Rome, because it was impossible, especially as Paul had been there, that the first of the apostles had not also been in the capital of the world. It is the political importance of the city of Rome which gives the first occasion to the legend of Peter. And, as the Papacy itself is founded on this legend, the origin of the Papacy is to be sought simply in the fact that the importance possessed by Rome as the capital of the world, settled upon the bishop of the Roman church.¹ True, another cause was requisite, viz., that there should be one who was chief among the apostles. But this circumstance, by itself, would not have had a decisive influence; for the primacy ascribed to Peter was not exclusive, nor was it believed that the words of Christ were to be taken in this sense. It was only in Rome that bishops, who claimed to be the successors of the apostle Peter in his primacy, could also maintain the actual primacy of the Church.

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (till the year 258), and his contemporaries the bishops of Rome, Cornelius and Stephanus, furnish the best standard for determining the relation which the Roman

¹ Both the political and the apostolic character of the city of Rome are referred to in the well-known passage of Irenaeus, iii. 3. 2, and in the potentior *principalitas* there enunciated respecting the Roman church. This church, as the congregation of the capital, is the *ecclesia maxima*. The passage so variously explained: "*ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos, qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio*" will be most correctly understood, as it appears to me, if we take the first part to express that which, from the nature of the matter, cannot be otherwise; the second, that which actually is so. "For every church must guide itself according to this church, by reason of the pre-eminent importance of Rome, as capital and as apostolic church; for believers come from every quarter to Rome, and thus the apostolic tradition has been maintained both in the Roman church and the church in general through those who, in all quarters, stand in connection with Rome."

church, already recognised as the cathedra Petri, bore to the Christian Church at the period about the end of the third and beginning of the fourth century. In the controversy concerning heretical baptism, the higher Stephanus's pretensions rose, the more emphatically did Cyprian and Firmilian assert against him the independence of the churches of Africa and Asia Minor. With regard to the subject of the controversy, it may appear a strange contradiction that it should be the Roman bishop who seemed to sacrifice the interests of unity to the validity of heretical baptism, and Stephanus's opponents were right enough in taking such advantage as this contradiction gave them.¹ But it is not merely devotion to unity that characterises the Roman Church; together with this, it exhibits the truly Catholic aspiration, to open the arms of the one saving Church as widely as possible to all that are capable of being received. Only from this point of view could Stephanus lower the objective nature of the sacrament to such a material idea as to declare the mere laying-on of hands to be sufficient in the case of all who had been once baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus,² and to regard the defenders of the one baptism in the one only true Church as Rebaptists.³

If we look back upon the circumstances that first occasioned and promoted the development and realisation of the episcopal

¹ Firmilian argues, *loc. cit.*, that the greater his pride in his episcopal see, the more preposterous it is that by the side of Peter, "super quem fundamenta ecclesiae collocata sunt, multas alias petras inducat."

² Cf. Cyprian, Ep. 74 (73). Si effectum baptismi majestati nominis tribuunt, ut qui in nomine Jesu Christi ubicunque et quomodocunque baptizantur, innovati et sanctificati judicentur, cur eadem majestas nominis non prevalet in manus impositione? How can those "filii Dei esse, qui non sint in ecclesia nati," heretics like the Marcionites and Valentinians?

³ Eusebius, E. H. vii. 5. When it is said, Philos. ix: 12, p. 291, that no one ventured to practise the *δεύτερον βάπτισμα* till the time of the Roman bishop Callistus, this is not to be understood, as Döllinger supposes (Hippol. and Callistus, p. 189 *sq.*), of heretical baptism, but of the baptism of the Elcesaites Alcibiades at Rome, Philos. p. 294. Stephanus was no doubt justified in appealing to the tradition of his church for the mere laying-on of hands; nothing had yet been dogmatically determined on the point. Nor did Cyprian contradict him here; only humana traditio was not to weigh more than divina dispositio, consuetudo not more than veritas.

idea, we find that it was unquestionably through the episcopate that the Christian Church first reached the consciousness of its unity as founded on belief in Christ. With this consciousness it acquired the power of a Catholic Church able to overcome all heresies and schisms, to advance beyond every kind of particularism, to cut off from itself all that was extreme, and to unite all allied elements; and through that strength it was able to establish itself as a permanent fact. But what did it avail that there existed a Church cast into this determinate form and organised for future existence, if that Church had no future before it, and was not to look forward to any development at all; if, believing in the immediate coming of Christ, it every moment expected the end of all things? Here we are brought back to Montanism. It was Montanism which maintained in the Church, in full vividness and energy, the thought of the catastrophe that impended in the immediate future, and thus, even on the very threshold of the Church's existence, placed its end before its eyes. On the other hand, it was the episcopate that, in opposition to Montanism, first made the existence and development of a Christian Church possible.

The controversy between the Montanists and their opponents points to a question with regard to which the Christian consciousness of this age was very much divided in itself. The opponents of Montanism saw in its moral requirements a doctrine of impracticable rigour. Nor in fact did they share the opinion that the end of the world was already so near, and that the most urgent duty of the time was to break with the world and to hold one's-self prepared for the great catastrophe. Since the belief in the immediate coming of Christ had not yet found its fulfilment, they drew the natural conclusion that it would probably remain unfulfilled in the next following period as well: that the end of the world was not yet so near as the Montanists supposed. But as the unnatural strain of mind, caused by the constant expectation of Christ's coming, was abated, the change inevitably influenced the whole practical demeanour of Christians. It was no longer possible to stand in an attitude of such sharp antagonism to the

world in which one lived; one was forced more and more to accommodate one's-self to the world. Now, since Montanism could see here only a secularising of Christianity, we must consider Montanism itself to have been a reaction against this tendency. When, in the eyes of the Montanist party, the customs of the day seemed to be growing too lax, they increased proportionably the strictness of practice in the Christian life by moral requirements, which they either now put forward for the first time, or affirmed to have a long-established validity. Such an opposition of opinions and parties having once arisen, the inevitable conflict could only acquire fresh vehemence with the increased frequency of cases where the Christian character was in a glaring way denied. What was the proper policy for such cases? The real essence of the question, however, did not lie in the doubtful point, whether those who were in this predicament were still to be recognised as Christians; but in this—could they be received back into the society of the Church through a forgiveness of sins to be granted through the power of the keys? On this point the general difference that separated the Montanists from the Catholic Church assumed the shape of an immediately practical question. In every case of commission of a so-called deadly sin, the Montanists utterly refused forgiveness, because such a sin, as committed against God himself, could only be forgiven by God, or, since God is the Spirit, by the Church, in so far as it is the Spirit; but the Church, in the new prophets, or through the Paraclete, had forbidden forgiveness. Their opponents, on the other hand, not only put forward the principle that even deadly sins could be forgiven, but ascribed to themselves the authority to forgive them.¹

The question thus controverted belongs, in the first instance, to dogma. But its importance for the history of the ecclesiastical constitution which was now growing into shape on the framework of the episcopate arises from the fact that the opponents who most prominently confronted the Montanists and their prophets, as the

¹ *Tert. de Pudic. cap. 21.*

organs of the Paraclete, were the bishops. It is very probable that in Asia Minor the movement against them was from the first headed by the bishops. The chief datum, however, from which we may infer the attitude of the bishops towards the Montanist question is the important fact, attested by Tertullian, that the bishop of Rome had openly declared that none of the sins, termed by the Montanists the deadly sins of adultery and fornication, were any more to operate an absolute exclusion from the communion of the Church; persons guilty of such sins were to receive forgiveness after performance of penance.¹ Though Tertullian speaks in an ironical tone of this peremptory (*i.e.* putting an end to the controversy) edict, which the bishop of Rome, he says, issued as a pontifex maximus or episcopus episcoporum,² it must have had a very decisive influence in bringing about the termination of the controversy. Hitherto the bishops of Rome had not declared themselves decidedly against the Montanists; and at the time of the arrival of Praxeas at Rome, probably under Eleutherus, they were even on the point of joining Christian communion with them. It was therefore an important event when, by the edict mentioned by Tertullian, the bishop (Victor, 190-200, or Zephyrinus, 200-15) put an end to all doubt concerning the attitude of the Roman church. So little sympathy was there in Rome with the moral principles of the Montanists. But Tertullian himself gives us to understand that the bishop of Rome did not here stand alone, but that it was the common episcopal interest which guided him; for he opposes to his Montanist assertion that the

¹ Ego, Tertullian reports the bishop to say in his edict, *et moechiae et fornicationis delicta poenitentia functis dimitto*.

² Gieseler, *K.-G.* i. 1, p. 288 (without any grounds, and in contradiction to the whole historical connection of Montanism), will have it that the bishop of Carthage is meant. The very fact that the appellations used do not imply a real, but only an arrogated dignity, exactly suits the bishop of Rome. And if Tertullian (according to Jerome, *Catal.* 53) stood on no good terms with the Roman clergy even before he became a Montanist, the irony of the expression is all the better explained. The *Philosophoumena*, ix. 12, p. 290, give some fresh information as to the practice with respect to forgiveness of sins, which was introduced into Rome under Zephyrinus, probably the bishop referred to by Tertullian.

ecclesia is "*spiritus per spiritalem hominem*," the antithesis "*non ecclesia numerus episcoporum*." However many bishops put forth the anti-Montanist principle that the Church can forgive such sins, still only the judgment of the Spirit, as it speaks in a spiritual man, can be decisive on such a question.

The needs and requirements which determined the action of the bishops may be discovered from those which influenced the Montanists; the two sets of motives are exactly contrary. The latter simply refused the forgiveness of mortal sins in order that, in view of the approaching end of the world, they might draw the reins of ecclesiastical discipline as tight as possible; and they wished the more to tighten them now that a large part of the Christian Church had so greatly relaxed them. The bishops, on the other hand, must, in accordance with their view of the world, have been of opinion that it might still be expedient to make arrangements for a more prolonged existence of the Church in the world. It was precisely at this time that the Church first acquired, in the episcopate, an organisation calculated for permanence; and the idea of a *continua successio*, apprehended with such fulness of meaning by the bishops, could not fail, while it bade them look back to the apostles, whose successors they claimed to be, to direct their contemplation to the future of the Church as well. If the bishops considered themselves as the officials of a church that was not to vanish forthwith from the world, but to continue to subsist in it, they must naturally have felt impelled to separate from the Christian society whatever might bring to mind the over-strained transcendentalism of the Christian consciousness at the outset of Christianity, and the sharp opposition to the world in which it had consequently stood, as such elements might too easily become the means of diverting the Church from the path in which she was to take her regular course in the world. The Church could not subsist in the world without contracting a more solid friendship with it than was possible, while it every moment expected the world's destruction. We need but imagine in what a peculiarly strained state of mind those must have lived, who, ever thinking on the

coming of Christ and the accompanying catastrophe, hovered as it were between existence and non-existence. How could a society of believers such as these plant its foot firmly in the world, while it saw the ground of its existence ever heaving beneath it, and the world's whole order collapsing in the immediate future? Again when, in accordance with the same belief, moral requirements were heightened to a degree that surpassed the common measure of human strength, here was another point of view in which the Church fell short of the conditions of a state of existence adapted to the present material order of things. What an exaggerated demand was made by the Montanists upon all the members of the Christian society—that they should remain absolutely free from all the transgressions which they included under the name of mortal sins! This was rigour so impracticable, that a society professedly governed by such a principle must soon see the moral force necessary for its subsistence consume itself in the internal struggle. The concession made with regard to the forgiveness of deadly sins was the first step that tended to harmonise a transcendental and never-to-be-realised idea with those actual facts which alone could afford a basis for the development of the idea into a permanent Church. If it was impossible that sins should completely disappear, it must at least be possible that they should be forgiven. The pure ideality of the Church was thus lost, but the idea of the Church became practical. The Christian body consisted, if not solely of saints completely untainted by any so-called deadly sin, at any rate of those whom the Church, by virtue of her power of the keys, could recognise as true members of the society. And if, as even the Montanists assumed, the Church had the right to forgive sins, why should it not make use of that right? Thus the bishops, when they came forward and placed themselves prominently at the head of the anti-Montanist party, in the question as to the lawfulness of forgiving deadly sins, proved in a way very characteristic of their position, that in them the Christian spirit had recovered from that over-strained mood of its early years, in which it had been

hardly self-possessed,—nay, almost beside itself. It was this policy of theirs which first made it possible that a Christian Church, following in its development the thread of the episcopal continua successio, should actually exist. The fact that among all the bishops it was the bishop of Rome whose authority had the most decisive influence calls us to notice how even at this early time the Roman bishops were entering on the road in which they afterwards understood only too well, both in theory and practice, how to guide the Church and the world hand in hand. The tendency to conform Christianity to the world, afterwards carried in the Roman Church to the utmost possible limits, is seen here in its first commencement, in a form quite innocent, and fully justified by the nature of the case in hand. In a word, we have a programme of indulgences for sins which the Montanist could only style *delicta moechiae et fornicationis*. Here we see the first step of that long and notorious history of the Roman grants of indulgences. Even at this time Tertullian, as if he had correctly divined the whole historical significance of the edict of the *episcopus episcoporum*, calls a *terrenum Dei templum*, in which the *sponsa Christi*, the *vera, pudica, sancta virgo*, is compelled to suffer even as a *macula aurium*, a *liberalitas* that should rather stand before the *januae libidinum*, a *spelunca moechorum et fornicatorum*.¹

The possibility of forgiveness of sins within the Church was, as the edict of the Roman bishop shows, declared as a principle;

¹ In tracing the relation of the Roman Church to Montanism back beyond the time of Tertullian, an important document is (as Ritschl first showed in detail, 1st ed. p. 546 *sq.*, 2d ed. p. 529 *sq.*), the Shepherd of Hermas. The chief theme of the Shepherd is the question of forgiveness of sins after baptism. A second repentance after baptism is permitted, but only within a certain limited period of time, only *usque in hodiernum diem*, until the *præfinita dies*. *Poenitentiae enim justorum habent fines. Impleti sunt dies poenitentiae omnibus sanctis, gentibus autem (i.e. those not yet baptized) usque in novissimo die.* The limit is more precisely determined by the figure of the building of the tower, under which the Church is represented. Penance may be done *dum aedificatur turris*. *Nam si consummata fuerit structura, jam quis non habet locum, ubi ponatur, erit reprobis.* The tower will soon be finished (*turris cito consummabitur*, Vis. 3, 8). The time allowed for the second repentance is thus only the time during

an important step was taken, that of guiding the Church into a path in which its continuous realisation was not to be hindered by the sinful nature of its members. It may now be shown, step by step, how the Church abandoned, or adopted only with essential modifications, all that in Montanism had asserted itself with fresh energy as the original form of the Christian consciousness. The whole movement is intimately connected with the crisis in the mind of the age which arrived at a decision by the aid of the episcopate.

The *extremitates temporum*, the *angustiae* of the *καὶρὸς συνεσταλμένος*, which lay heavy on the heart of Tertullian, and produced in him so gloomy a frame of mind, are not spoken of by Cyprian, though his mode of thought is exclusively founded on that of Tertullian. Though convinced that the world will not endure much longer, Cyprian sees in this fact only the general

which the tower is being built, till the second coming of Christ, which is immediately at hand (Sim. ix. 7-10). The completion of the building marks, as Ritschl successfully shows, that epoch of the Church which was to be fixed by the appearance of Montanism. Montanism, however, conceived this point of time as so near, that the idea of the possibility of a second repentance did not arise. The Church therefore appears to Hermas in the first vision in the form of an aged woman, and blames him for a secret concupiscence, and for devotion to worldly business; in the second vision she appears with youthful aspect, but grey hair; in the third young and joyous. Since it is in these last two visions that she makes the disclosures concerning the cessation of the second penance, it is plain that the revived youth of the Church and the renewal of the Spirit are supposed to be caused by that abolition of the second penance which is intended to counteract the increasing conformity of the Church to the world as delineated in the first vision. Ritschl shows further that the Shepherd of Hermas also assumes an attitude of opposition to the clergy, while the clergy justify with their authority this conformity to the world and the repetition of penance; and that the antithesis between the Shepherd and the clergy is the same as that between the Montanists and the Psychici. The Roman Church, then, about the middle of the second century, the time of Hermas, was stirred, quite independently of Montanism, by the same question which in the latter came to its sharpest expression. "Hermas marks a local prelude of the phenomena which, beginning from Phrygia, threw almost all parts of the Church into excitement and disorder. He opens the series of the separations which fill the next century, and during that time occupy the Roman Church incessantly. Between the Montanist movement in Rome and the Novatian schism stands the secession of Hippolytus, at the beginning of the third century." Ritschl, p. 538.

truth that the world is now aged, and has lost the freshness of its strength,—a truth that bears no relation to the immediate coming of Christ, nor in fact to Christianity.¹ In proportion as Christians came over to the standpoint of the secular mind on this subject, the strictness of the practical requirements which had been deduced from the original exaggerated theory was relaxed. With Tertullian *castrare desideria carnis* was a categorical command of the Paraclete, and a transgression of the command could only be regarded as a deadly sin. With the more moderate Cyprian, the same requirement is merely presented to the moral consciousness of the Christian in the form of recommendation and advice. If he follows it, it is a meritorious act, and he acquires a claim to a higher reward; but though he refuses to comply, his moral perfection in other respects is not thereby compromised. But it is especially with reference to millenarianism that we see the relinquishment of the fanatical tendency which had so highly excited the Montanist imagination. The antipathy to this doctrine became more and more general; indeed, there was now felt an active desire to combat it, and to deny the principle of its existence; and it is characteristic of the present turning-point of Christian development that this was the case not only in the Alexandrian Church, which was always an opponent of millenarianism, but also, and chiefly, in the Church of Rome, and that about the time at which the same Church completely broke with Montanism. The Roman presbyter Caius, one of the chief representatives of the new tendency, though he did not go so far as to declare the Apococalypse of John to be the work of the heretic Cerinthus, yet all the more energetically combated in Cerinthus the material millenarian belief of Judaism.² Millenarianism now stood for what had been left behind in the advance that had been made from Judaism, and all that pertained to it, to Christianity. In this view, with the disappearance of the circumstances which had once given a particular belief its hold on men's minds, the

¹ *Ad Demetrianum*, c. 3, ed. Krabinger, Tub. 1859, p. 156.

² Eusebius, iii. 23, cf. *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 157 sq.

belief itself was necessarily to be relinquished. On the other hand, other parts of the same system were to be preserved though in a changed form. The moral and ascetic requirements of the Montanists were not given up, but merely adapted to the Catholic Church; and still less could their principle of revelation, the Holy Spirit, be regarded as belonging exclusively to them. Each side alike presupposed that the Spirit and the Church are essentially connected, that the Church has its true essence in the Spirit, and the Spirit has its real existence in the Church: the great offence felt by the Catholic party arose from the vague, arbitrary, fortuitous nature of Montanist prophecy, from its tendency to introduce novelty, to set up a new principle of faith in the separate individuals whom it made its organs. In this sense it was said to be an instance of the folly of the Montanists that they should wish to assert their own theory as Catholic; and their doctrine was affirmed to lead to a consequence which marked it as heresy, namely, that if they believed themselves to be the first who received the Paraclete promised by Christ, they thereby denied the possession of the Paraclete to the apostles.¹ It thus came about quite consistently with the attitude of the Catholic Church towards Montanism that the working of the Holy Spirit, who in the Montanist Paraclete moved in the free scope of the subjectivity of separate individuals endowed with the gift of prophecy, was now fixed and regulated in accordance with Catholic ideas. As the keys of the power to bind and to loose, claimed by the Montanist prophets for themselves, came into the hands of the bishops exclusively, so the bishops were now the sole acknowledged organs of the Holy Spirit. The principle of individuality, on which Montanist prophecy rested, was now opposed by the maxim that the Holy Spirit, as the governing principle in the Church, spoke only in the collective number of the Church's representatives, and that the latter might the more surely believe themselves to be inspired by him, the firmer and clearer was their consciousness that they represented the Church. Thus the

¹ Schwegler, *Mont.* p. 225, 238.

influence, for whose operation the Montanist revelations offered such an irregular and uncertain course, was made to adopt the ordered and regular movement of councils representing the Church. The continuity with the Spirit that worked in the apostles, which in the Paraclete of the Montanists seemed such a weak and easily dissoluble bond, was firmly established by the dogma that the resolutions of councils do but proclaim to the general consciousness the principles of an apostolic tradition ever immanent in the Church. Under this form of the revelation of the Spirit the ecstasy peculiar to Montanist prophecy was necessarily excluded. Only the individual mind can, through the operation of the Spirit, fall in ecstasy into such a state of transport as to lose control over itself. If the Spirit speaks in the collective mind of many separate beings, it is inconceivable that the common product, which is to be taken as the Spirit's utterance, can be arrived at in any other way than through common deliberation, guided by reflection. According to Tertullian, the individual, when seized by the Spirit, is necessarily thrown into a state of transport. He therefore does not hesitate to place the essence of prophecy precisely in the loss of conscious control over the mind, or *amentia*.¹ Now prophecy has its only basis in the relation which the individual privately bears to the Spirit, when, unable to be other than passive under him, he must allow the Spirit so to work in him that he is carried away from his centre of consciousness and brought into a state of transport. It follows naturally that the relation of the Spirit to the mind of a multitude of individuals, as that relation is shown in the bishops assembled in councils, cannot bear the same external and fortuitous character. The more the inadequacy of man to the Spirit is removed in the infinitely enlarged number of inspired persons, the more it becomes necessary to conceive the Spirit as the substantial principle dwelling in the collective number of those persons. It therefore resulted from the nature of the case that there was no longer any place for the ecstatic prophecy of the Mon-

¹ *De Anima*, cap. 11.

tanists when the organs of the Spirit were taken to be, not individuals in their fortuitous subjectivity, but the bishops in the regular form of the representation of the Church. Here was another point in which the opposition of the episcopate to Montanism marked the change from the unsettled condition of the earliest Christians to the firm and ordered subsistence of the Catholic Church. If we go further back, we must hold the true and ultimate cause of ecstatic Montanist prophecy to have been the old transcendental view of the world—the peculiar form of consciousness natural to the early Christians, so long as, in their belief in the nearness of Christ's coming, they stood with one foot in the present, and the other in the future world. This was no sober self-possessed state of mind; rather, the mind was transported beyond itself: ecstasy was its characteristic form. There can therefore be no more plainly distinctive mark of the crisis which now everywhere followed, than the definite declaration that ecstasy suits neither the prophetic spirit nor the Christian mind.¹ Henceforth it is an orthodox conception, that the prophets of the Old Testament did not prophesy in ecstasy, without control over their own minds, but in the full possession of their consciousness and understanding. Ecstasy is held to be an unworthy condition, characteristic of demonic heathenism, while the full self-possession of the inspired being is regarded as an essential determining idea of any theory of inspiration that professes to hold a Christian standpoint. The Christian mind has taken up a firm position in the existing world, and sees that in Christianity, as it gradually assumes the form of the Catholic Church, there is founded a newly-developing order of things; and accordingly, even in the presence of the operations of the Divine Spirit, it feels itself strong enough to keep its self-possession, and to hold firmly to its self-consciousness.²

¹ Among the opponents of the Montanists in Asia Minor, Miltiades wrote a book entitled *Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἐκστάσει λαλεῖν*. Euseb. E. H. v. 17; Cf. Schwegler, p. 227.

² It is worthy of observation that even the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, though they give so high a place to prophecy, declare themselves against the

From what has been said, it is evident how important was the influence of the episcopate in the formation and development of the Church. Through the episcopate the Church acquired its determinate form; it was in the bishops that men were first found, upon whom it could be conceived that the highest privileges conferred by Christ himself on his apostles had passed in all their fulness. What the Church as a whole was, in its essence and its peculiar principle, concentrated and showed forth itself in them. The Holy Spirit is for Christians in general the principle of their consciousness, the peculiar Spirit which animates them, and makes them *ἄγιοι* in the same manner in which Christ himself, as endued or anointed with the Holy Spirit, the principle of Messiahship, is simply the *ἄγιος*; the principle working in the Christian society, which, wherever the needs of Christianity require, intervenes with its divine power; and all this he is in the highest and most concentrated way in the bishops. They, of all others, are the depositaries and possessors of the Divine Spirit indwelling in the Church. As Christ, when he conferred his Spirit on his apostles, committed to them also full power to forgive sins, so in the bishops this right, as the highest power committed to the Church, accompanies the possession of the Spirit. By the *successio apostolica* and the *vicaria ordinatio*, the same potestas passes from the apostles to the bishops, and from one bishop to another. As Christ, when he gave the power to forgive sins, granted to the apostles the highest privilege that he could leave them, so with the power of the keys the episcopal office is invested with the highest attributes.¹ The Church first attains

admissibility of ecstasy in divine things. Influenced by the same motives which prompted the action of the Catholic Church, they regard ecstasy as incompatible alike with an ordered constitution of the Church, such as the episcopal system supplies, and with any high stage of the development of the Christian mind. They expressly oppose to ecstasy, with its demonic deception, the indwelling consciousness of the *ἑμψυχον καὶ ἀέναν πνεῦμα*, which is not only in the prophets, but in all pious men. See *supra*, vol. i. p. 241.

¹ Compare Cyprian, Ep. 75 (74), where Bishop Firmilian, after citing the passage John xx. 21, says: Potestas ergo remittendorum peccatorum apostolis data est et ecclesiis quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt, et episcopis qui eis ordinatione

self-consciousness in the bishops; for in them its whole power concentrates itself, and finds a head and a living unity, and they are therefore the consciousness of the Church itself; and this consciousness must deliver itself in them in a determinate form. The conditions of this form are implied in the conception of the office. Though every bishop is the same as that which all the others are, yet he is that which he is, not when taken alone, but only when taken together with all the rest. Therefore the consciousness of the Church, represented by the bishops, cannot speak in any single bishop taken alone, but only in a larger or smaller number of assembled bishops. It was accordingly inevitable that from the very beginning of the episcopal constitution synods should be held. Whenever questions of common interest, requiring common action, happened to arise, it was felt to be reasonable to take counsel together and form resolutions, as was done first on occasion of the questions of Montanism and Easter; and it very soon became customary to hold meetings of this kind at regularly

vicaria successerunt. Here the original right of the churches is not yet quite forgotten, for the bishops only obtain the apostolic right through the churches founded by the apostles, which stand as connecting links between the latter and the bishops. With reference to the passage John xx. 21, those who regard the Gospel of John as post-apostolic will easily believe that its attitude towards this great question of the day was analogous to that it took up with regard to the question of Easter. In the application of the title Paraclete to the Holy Spirit, the Gospel agrees with the Montanists. The apostolic power to bind and to loose is taken to mean the right to forgive sins, in the same sense which was assigned to this power when the Montanists and their opponents disputed over it. It is also grounded on the Montanist fundamental principle (not mentioned either in Matt. xvi. 19 or Matt. xviii. 18), the *πνεῦμα ἁγίου*. Here too, as in the question of Easter, the Gospel placed itself on the side of that view which came to prevail as the catholic one. When it gives the words of Jesus, "As the Father hath sent me, so send I you," as containing the reason for the gift of the Holy Spirit to the apostles, it expresses both the idea of apostolic succession and the principle that there must always be successors of the apostles, invested with the like right to forgive sins. It is remarkable that John xx. 21 is cited by Cyprian and Firmilian, but not by Tertullian. Cyprian says, referring to the passage: "*unde intelligimus, nonnisi in ecclesia praepositis et in evangelica lege ac dominica ordinatione fundatis licere baptizare et remissam peccatorum dare.*" It seemed to him, then, that what the Gospel here says of the apostles holds good of the bishops likewise, and of them alone. This Tertullian could not concede.

recurring periods. Such meetings, while they proceeded from the consciousness of the bishops as to the position which they held as members and officials of the Church, could not but serve to strengthen greatly in their minds the feeling that they belonged to a special order, and to give the synods the character of a universal ecclesiastical representation.¹ It is an essential quality of such a representation, that its importance increases with the number of its representing members. Accordingly, even before the episcopal constitution passed the step which led to metropolitan dignity, the synodal constitution had reached its immediate goal in the first general synod, which, as œcumenical, exhibited in itself the collective number of the bishops of the Roman Empire; and as each bishop was able to regard himself as a special organ of the Holy Spirit, and what was true of the individual must be still more indisputably true of a number of bishops, here, too, the principle which lay at the base of the ecclesiastical constitution reached its complete external manifestation in the œcumenical synods. According to the Acts, the assembly held by the apostles at Jerusalem issued its resolution in the name of the Holy Spirit; and if even provincial synods afterwards made use of the same formula,² it was still more natural to believe that in the collective number of the bishops assembled in an œcumenical council the will of God revealed itself, under the influence of the Holy Spirit.³

The system whose fundamental characteristics have been here set forth contains, even as it appears in those first beginnings

¹ Tert. de Jej. c. 13: *Aguntur per Graecias illa certis in locis concilia ex universis ecclesiis, per quae et altiora quaeque in commune tractantur, et ipsa repraesentatio totius nominis christiani magna veneratione celebratur.* Compare Cypr. Ep. 75 (74), where Firmilian says: *Necessario apud nos fit, ut per singulos annos seniores et presbyteri in unum conveniamus ad disponenda ea, quae curae nostrae commissa sunt, ut, si qua graviora, communi consilio dirigantur.*

² As the synod at Carthage under Cyprian in the year 252. See Cypr. Ep. 54: *Placuit nobis, sancto spiritu suggerente.*

³ Cp. Socr. i. 9, where Constantine, in his letter to the church of Alexandria, says of the Nicene synod:—*Ὁ γὰρ τοῖς τριακοσίοις ἤρρεσεν ἐπισκόποις, οὐδέν ἐστιν ἕτερον ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ γνώμη, μάλιστα γε ὅπου τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τοιούτων καὶ τηλικούτων ἀνδρῶν ταῖς διανοαῖς ἐγκειμένον, τὴν θείαν βούλησιν ἐξεφώτισεν.*

which were the natural outgrowth of existing circumstances, the elements of a most comprehensive and thoroughgoing hierarchy. The greatness of its plan consists in the simplicity of the forms on which it is based. The fundamental form is the relation of the bishop to the congregation beneath him. However the system may develop, expand, or modify itself, this form always remains unaltered. The bishop of the smallest church, and the Pope at the highest stage of the Papacy, are in essence the same. At all stages of the hierarchy we find but a repetition of the same fundamental form, the chief peculiarity of which consists precisely in its capacity for a boundless expansion. Though qualitatively always the same, the episcopate yet admits of great quantitative variation; the relation of equality is also one of subordination, ascending upwards by a series of stages and intermediate members; and thus the episcopate becomes a form which not only extends over the widest field, but includes within itself the capacity of a very well-articulated organism. This element of difference in a system ascending in various forms through successive steps of subordination is an essential part of the idea of a hierarchy. There cannot be a hierarchy in which all the members are equal. The bishop must be more than the presbyter and the deacon, the presbyter more than the deacon; and whatever the number of stages through which the system rises to its highest point, the distinction of these three degrees is the determining type of the whole. On the one hand, as the bishops stand on a level, each one being the same as that which all the rest are, the system tends to broaden its base as much as possible. On the other, since difference does exist among the bishops, it equally endeavours to gather itself together in its highest point, and to terminate its structure in a supreme unity. The principle of the subordination is not less characteristic of the ecclesiastical system than the subordination itself. It is not only a hierarchical, but also a theocratic system; and the theocratic character is likewise inherent in the simple fundamental form. The subordination demanded is an

absolute requirement; it bears the same character of intrinsic necessity as that subordination which must be the relation of the human to the divine. The root notion of the episcopate is that the bishop is the representative of God and Christ, the organ in which the Holy Spirit, as the indwelling principle of the ecclesiastical society, chiefly delivers himself. All rests on divine authority. In the relation of the bishop to his congregation, the same relation is beheld which exists between Christ and the Church. On the one hand, it postulates an unconditional subordination, since all is grounded upon unity alone. As there is one God and one Christ, so there can be only one Church and one episcopate, and all must be simply subordinated to this unity. On the other side, however, it is a relation of piety, and all the feelings of piety which are included in the religious relation of man to God and Christ are interwoven with it. The bishop is to be the spiritual father of his church, and the members of his church are to cling to him with the confidence of children.¹ If then we place before our minds the original elements of this system, we find that its

¹ The Apostolic Constitutions prescribe, ii. 34, τὸν ἐπίσκοπον στέργειν ὀφείλετε ὡς πατέρα, but withal φοβεῖσθαι ὡς βασιλέα, τιμᾶν ὡς Κύριον. What is true of the bishop is true also of the clergy in general. In accordance with the sacerdotal ideas of the Old Testament, which Cyprian, the chief representative of the episcopal idea, adopts in their fullest extent, the clergy are held to be distinguished from the world by the same absolute superiority with which the bishop stands above his congregation. Therefore it is a mere degradation of their order, if they occupy themselves with worldly business and worldly things. According to Cyprian, Ep. 66, it was "pridem in concilio episcoporum statutum, ne quis de clericis et Dei ministris tutorem vel curatorem testamento suo constituat, quando singuli divino sacerdotio honorati et in clerico ministerio constituti nonnisi altari et sacrificiis deservire, et precibus atque orationibus vacare debeant.—Quae nunc ratio et forma in clero tenetur, ut qui in ecclesia Domini ordinatione clerica promoventur,—in honore sportulantium fratrum tanquam decimas ex fructibus accipientes, ab altaris sacrificiis non recedant." The decretum sacerdotum must be strictly maintained, "ne quis sacerdotes et ministros Dei altari ejus et ecclesiae vacantes ad seculares molestias devocet." The words of Cyprian express the great practical importance of this principle, and the view of the sacerdotal character of the clergy on which it rested. Compare Ep. Clem. ad Jac. c. 5, Hom. iii. 11.

essential condition is a stage of religious development at which there is felt a need to view the relation borne by Christ to the Church, as the Church's Lord, imaged in a visible representation. As the apostles took the place of Christ who sent them, so the bishops, as the successors of the apostles, could only be regarded as the representatives of Christ.

PART FOURTH.

CHRISTIANITY AS HIGHEST PRINCIPLE OF REVELATION— AND AS DOGMA.

WHEN we look back on the facts which have been passed in review, we observe two directions in which the idea of Christianity, indwelling in the Christian consciousness, realised itself. First of all, the limits within which Jewish particularism sought to confine the Christian principle of salvation had to be broken through, and Christian universalism to be firmly established. This could only be done by taking away the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, and by regarding the whole of mankind, in its need of the Christian salvation, and its readiness to receive it, as the wide field in which the idea of Christianity was to be realised. But while Christianity thus had from the first the tendency to expand itself into universalism, at the same time it felt it to be equally necessary to maintain, along with its universal point of view, its specific contents and character, and to arrive at an adjustment between its desire to be universal, and its desire to be specific, *i.e.* personal and individual, concrete and historical. By its universalism it was transported into the wide sphere of a view of the world thoroughly penetrated with heathen elements. It was brought into the closest contact with a mode of view in which Judaism, mixed with Greek philosophical ideas, was already so much decomposed, that Christianity too, when drawn within the same circle of ideas, necessarily assumed a character more or less allied to heathen polytheism. The Christian process of

salvation was changed into a universal process of world-development, in which Christ himself became merely one of the various conditioning principles of the world. In a word, secularisation was the danger which threatened Christianity on the side of its universalism. Montanism, from its moral and religious point of view, believed that this danger must be met by breaking with the world altogether; it made the Jewish-Messianic catastrophe of the world the principle of its position. On this side again then it became the task of the Christian mind to lead Christianity into such a path as would enable it to enter on a historical development corresponding to its original idea. When the idea of the Catholic Church was reached, all the steps found necessary on these various sides were taken. It was by this idea that all those were animated who wished at once to maintain Christian universalism, and to repel all that obscured the specific character of Christianity by Jewish or heathen influences, and all that seemed to take an extreme tendency in one direction or the other.

The idea of the Catholic Church existed, in the first instance, merely in the consciousness of the great majority; and its presence in their minds led them to endeavour, and that successfully, to realise it and give it a firm consistency. But so long as the Catholic Church thus continued to acquire its shape merely by the negative means of forming a contrast to all inadequate Christianity, it remained nothing but a form. For this form a determinate matter must now be found. There might be much agreement as to what should be kept away and repelled in accordance with the Christian consciousness, as it uttered itself in the majority. But it was not less important to couple affirmation with denial, and to determine positively what matter should be deemed intrinsic to the Christian consciousness itself. The Church had certainly taken a determinate form of constitution, since it had bishops, who could be regarded as the upholders and representatives of apostolic tradition and the consciousness of the Church. But this consciousness itself remained something very indeterminate, a mere form without matter, so long as dogma, as the matter of the apostolic

tradition, or of Christian revelation, had not been brought by development and gradual elaboration to its definite conception and expression. The synod of Nicaea, which concludes the first period of the history of the development of the Christian Church, brings very clearly before us the connection between this form and this matter—the constitutional form which the Church had received in the bishops, the representatives of its unity, and dogma as the matter, which the interpreters of tradition and the organs of the consciousness of the Church were to express, and to fix as the universally accepted doctrine. This synod, as œcumenical, is the most perfect representation of the episcopate and the Church; and in its dogma of the homoousia it expressed the highest that is contained in the dogmatic matter of the Christian consciousness.

It is thus the subject of dogma which now claims our attention. The Church would have been a mere form had it not contained within those bounds which, though firmly defined by itself, expanded equally on all sides to the broad idea of the Catholic Church, a definite matter in its Catholic dogma. It is in the doctrine of the person or the divine dignity of Christ that the whole development of dogma, in its first period, is concentrated. The greater or less prominence of all the dogmas contained in the matter of Christian belief is in proportion to their nearer or more remote relation to this chief dogma. This itself, however, highly placed as it is, is not in fact the nearest and immediate object of the Christian consciousness. For since Christ only comes in order to bring the Messianic salvation, he bears the relation of a mean to an end; and therefore, in the development of dogma, the one is evidently conditioned by the other. We can perceive, through the whole history of dogma, how the doctrine of the person of Christ, in the various forms of its elaboration, is but the reflection, the concrete expression of the views which were held concerning the work of Christ, the import and the nature of the Messianic salvation wrought by him. Each age, each party, invests the person of Christ with all the determining notions which, in its opinion, it is necessary to presuppose in order to make him capable of

being, in the determinate sense in which he requires to be, the Redeemer.

At the point of view taken by a critical consideration of the Gospel history, we are never at liberty to forget that what we know of Christ's doctrine generally, and of his doctrine concerning the import and dignity of his own person, only reaches us through the medium of the New Testament writers. Here also we must strictly distinguish the purely historical from the dogmatic point of view. We have to confine ourselves to the question, How is the person of Jesus portrayed in the various dogmatic conceptions found in the canonical books? All else belongs to the category of dogmatic presuppositions and affirmations, whatever the foundations of these may be.

First, we have the Christology of the synoptic gospels, and here it cannot be contended on any sufficient grounds that they give us the slightest justification for advancing beyond the idea of a purely human Messiah. The idea of pre-existence lies completely outside the synoptic sphere of view. Nothing can show this more clearly than the narrative of the supernatural birth of Jesus. All that raises him above humanity—though it does not take away the pure humanity of his person—is to be referred only to the causality of the *πνεῦμα ἁγίου*, which brought about his conception, or which, according to another view, descended on him at his baptism. This spirit, as the principle of the Messianic epoch, is also the element which constitutes his Messianic personality. The synoptic Christology has for its substantial foundation the notion of the Messiah, designated and conceived as the *υἱὸς Θεοῦ*; and all the points in the working out of the notion rest on the same supposition of a nature essentially human. God raised him from the dead, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it (Acts ii. 24). It is in itself impossible that the Messiah should fall a prey to death, because if he fell under the power of death, he would not be the Messiah. Thus even though the Messiah dies, yet death is annulled in life in him, if not in the supernatural nature of his person, yet in his Messianic dignity.

In the same sense, it is part of the conception of the Messiah, that he is the Prince of Life (Acts iii. 15). The highest enunciation concerning Christ in the synoptic Christology is, that all power is given unto him in heaven and in earth (Matt. xxviii. 18); or that he sits at the right hand of God,—an expression which denotes his immediate share in the divine power and the divine government of the world. He is exalted to this point by his death and resurrection. The connecting link between these two points which join heaven and earth is the Ascension, in which he is even seen to float from earth to heaven in visible form.

It is obvious, that in this Christology the general point of view is the elevation of the human to the divine, and that in the conception of the Messiah the second of these steps always implies the first. In contrast to this point of view stands that of the Johannine Logos-idea. According to this, the substantial conception of the person of Jesus is the conception of his essence as divine in itself. Here the thought travels, not from below upwards, but from above downwards, and the human is therefore only a secondary thing, and added afterwards.

Between these two opposing points of view, the Christology of Paul occupies a place of its own, and we cannot fail to see that it gives us the key of the transition from the one to the other. On one side Christ is essentially man, on the other he is more than man; and his humanity is already so enhanced and idealised, that the sense in which he is man is certainly inconsistent with the synoptic mode of view, which stands on the firm basis of his historical and human appearance. Christ is man, not only on one side of his being; but simply: he is man, like Adam, and only distinguished from Adam in that the peculiar element of his being is not the natural but the spiritual. And if, notwithstanding his spiritual nature, he is man, it is a necessary consequence that both the spiritual and the natural are an integral part of human nature. Over against the one man, through whom sin and death came into the world, stands the one man Jesus Christ, in whom the grace of God is given to the many (Rom. v. 15). As

by one man came death, so by one man came the resurrection of the dead (1 Cor. xv. 21). As Adam was the first man, so is Christ the second man from heaven (ver. 47).¹ Christ is then essentially man, man like Adam, only man in a higher sense. The question now can only be, what higher conception we must unite with the person of Christ, while we rest on the substantial foundation of his human nature. The higher principle of the person of Christ is styled by the apostle the spiritual, the heavenly in him. By this he does not mean that a divine principle, different from human nature, descended and united with it; on the contrary, the higher principle is only the purer form of human nature itself. Christ, as the pneumatic man, who is from heaven or of heavenly origin, is the archetypal man, who shows forth in himself the perfection of human nature. As Adam, being the earthly natural man, is the man that has passed under sin and death, so Christ, being the spiritual, heavenly man, as he in whom the lower part of human nature is lost in the higher, is the sinless man. That Christ was without sin (2 Cor. v. 21), is a notion which essentially determines the conception of him. As Adam, with sin, which first began to manifest its power in him, had also the principle of death in him, so Christ being free from sin, was also free from death. He was not only not subject to the principle of death: he had in him the contrary principle of life, the quickening Spirit. As free from sin, he would not have been bound to die: in fact it was not on his own account that he submitted to the necessity of death, but because he took on himself the sins of men: in his thus dying, because he took on himself the sins of men, it is presupposed that *σὰρξ*, apart from sin, is mortal in itself. If the *σὰρξ* of Christ was only a *ὁμολωμα σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*, or—since *ἁμαρτία* is not to be separated from *σὰρξ*, *σὰρξ* being as such the seat of *ἁμαρτία*,

¹ It is not unimportant for a correct comprehension of the Pauline Christology, that according to the latest critical authorities, in 1 Cor. xv. 47, *κύριος* does not belong to the text. There is thus no longer any hindrance to the immediate connection of *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* with *ἄνθρωπος*. Each of these terms is applied to Christ by the apostle: he is, as *ἄνθρωπος*, *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*.

containing its root and predisposed to it—a *ὁμοίωμα* of *σὰρξ* in general,¹ then *σὰρξ* is a mere accident of Christ's nature; its true substance can only be *πνεῦμα*. As the apostle says simply (2 Cor. iii. 17), Christ is in himself, in his substantial essence, *πνεῦμα*, spirit. The essence of spirit was conceived by the apostle as a spiritual luminous substance; as a luminous splendour in the sense in which he speaks of the shining face of Moses (2 Cor. iii. 7 sq.). The eternal light-essence of God himself is reflected in this splendour of Christ. The whole relation of Christ to God rests on this, that Christ is essentially spirit, because it belongs to the spiritual light-nature of God to be reflected in a luminous splendour. Christ is therefore, as he is *τὸ πνεῦμα*, so also the *κύριος τῆς δόξης*, essentially spirit and light. And he does not first become this after his exaltation, but is it essentially: for his exaltation is simply the attainment to its full reality of that which he already was.

The idea of pre-existence is involved in this. The apostle can therefore only have conceived Christ, although he is supposed to have been essentially man in his pre-existing personality, as the spiritual light-form of the heavenly or archetypal man. It is an analogous representation which we find in the Christology of the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, where the primal man came forth first from God, by means of the wisdom which dwelt with God from eternity, or the Holy Spirit, which, since it dwells in Christ in the highest sense, and so forms his true essence, is also called the Spirit of Christ. The apostle must therefore have assumed a twofold primal man: an earthly man, who was from the beginning *ἐκ γῆς χοϊκὸς* and of psychical nature, and a heavenly archetypal

¹ Where *σὰρξ* is without *ἀμαρτία*, the apostle speaks only of a *ὁμοίωμα σαρκὸς*, or, since *σὰρξ* and *ἀμαρτία* belong to one another, of a *ὁμοίωμα σαρκὸς ἀμαρτίας*. This mode of speech shows most clearly that he conceived *ἀμαρτία* as the essence of *σὰρξ* itself. Where *σὰρξ* is not a *σὰρξ ἀμαρτίας*, i.e. a *σὰρξ*, part of whose essence is *ἀμαρτία*, there there is nothing which can properly be called *σὰρξ*; it is not a *σὰρξ ἀμαρτίας*, and therefore not a true *σὰρξ*, but a mere *ὁμοίωμα*: he is only *ὅμοιος* to us. The Pauline Christology makes use also of the distinction of *σὰρξ* and *σῶμα*. There is a *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, but not a *σὰρξ πνευματικῇ*, for flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God (1 Cor. xv. 44, 50).

man, who pre-existed in heaven, till at the appointed time he appeared in the flesh as the *δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*, as the second Adam, or the *ἔσχατος*, as he is called with reference to the opening of the second or last period of the world by his coming into it. Nothing further can be said as to the mode in which the apostle conceived the birth of Christ in the flesh, and his entrance into humanity. Although the sending of the Son spoken of in Gal. iv. 4 and Rom. viii. 3 presupposes his existence, yet this is only the same pre-existence which is already involved in the *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* of 1 Cor. xv. 47. These passages give no further information as to the manner of his appearance in the flesh. It is a general peculiarity of the Pauline Christology, that though it presupposes the pre-existence of Christ, the apostle's gaze is rather directed forwards to that which Christ has come to be, than backwards to that which he was in the past. This is the point of view from which we have to regard Rom. i. 3 *sq.*, a passage of importance for the apostle's Christology. The apostle here intends to bring together all the features which make up the conception of Christ's Messianic dignity. As the son of David, he is the Messiah; but a still more decisive proof of his Messiahship is this, that he was raised from the dead. What Christ is bodily as the son of David, that he is spiritually by his resurrection. This is the spiritual attestation of his Messianic dignity: for this, and this alone, could give actual tangible proof that the Spirit, which alone made him the Messiah, was actually in him. This is the conception of the *πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης*. This *πνεῦμα* is the *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* working the *ἁγιοσύνη* through which Christ is the *ἅγιος*, and Christians are the *ἅγιοι*, that is to say, actively proving itself to be the Messianic principle, and realising the idea of Messiahship. If we add this to the other steps of the Pauline Christology, we may determine this conception of Christ's personality in the following way. First, Christ is in himself, in his substantial essence, spirit: and his spiritual nature necessarily involves the conception of pre-existence in the ideal form of the primal man. Secondly, in the earthly and human manifestation of Christ, the Spirit, as the essential element

of his personality, becomes the Messianic Spirit,—the *πνεῦμα* becomes the *πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης*. Thirdly, as it is by his resurrection that Christ finally proves himself to be the Son of God in the highest sense, so the *πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης* first manifests itself in its full significance by its acting effectively as the *πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν*. As the Messianic Spirit to the person of Christ, so is the quickening Spirit to humanity in general, as the principle of life which works in it, removes sin and death, and glorifies the mortal *σὰρξ* into the image of the heavenly man. The idea represented in Christ, as the primal man, is fully realised when all humanity is conformed to his image, according to the determination of God (Rom. viii. 29).¹

The doctrine of the majesty of Christ was first fixed dogmatically by the apostle Paul. The belief in the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus, and in the attestation of his Messianic dignity given by these facts, necessarily involved, no doubt, a higher conception of his person. A more precise determination of this conception, however, was still desirable. The first point,

¹ There is one question which might still be raised. Though Christ was *ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*, do not the names of *δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος* and *ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ* date from his earthly and human manifestation? But what can Christ have been as *πνεῦμα*, if his spiritual personality is not to be conceived in the form of human existence? It is affirmed that on the foundation of that doctrine of angels which the Jews combined with the Messianic idea, there rose a mode of conception, widely adopted in the early Church, especially among the people, according to which the pre-existent subject which appeared in Jesus was an angel; and an application of this to the Pauline Christology has been attempted (Theol. Jahrb. 1848, pp. 239 sq.). But there is nothing which indicates that Paul conceived Christ as an angel or a being like an angel: nor are we justified in giving either of the two ideas—that he was a spirit, and that he was essentially man—a less important place than the other. There is unquestionably a strong probability that in the passage 1 Cor. viii. 6, the apostle meant to ascribe not only pre-existence, but creation to Christ. But on the other hand, again, it cannot be controverted, that as *ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα* is limited and defined by the conception in *Θεός*, so is *δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα* limited by *κύριος*. The conception of *κύριος* refers only to that which Christ became by his resurrection and exaltation, not to his antemundane state. If in 1 Cor. xv. 47 *κύριος* is to be rejected, this passage also makes no exception with regard to the meaning of the word *κύριος*. The passages 1 Cor. x. 4, 2 Cor. viii. 9, and Rom. ix. 5, apart from the considerations given above, are not conclusive. They only show how arbitrarily the conception of Christ's Godhead has been extended within the Pauline Christology.—On the Pauline Christology generally, cf. my work *Paulus*, T. T. F. L. ii. 239-253.

from which the whole development started, was the resurrection. It was not possible to conceive the risen one, him who through his resurrection had become the conqueror over the grave, and had entered on a higher life, without imagining him as in a state of glorification, and in the most immediate nearness to God. He thus became the subject of all those determining notions which are included in the idea of *κύριος*, as he is simply called after his exaltation. But all the attributes ascribed to him as the risen one, as exalted to the right hand of the Father, still lacked a sufficient basis as long as his glorified state after his life on earth was not coupled with one of equal elevation preceding the same. A higher view of his personality generally could only be attained if he was the same before his earthly and human manifestation as he became after it. The majesty to which he was exalted after his death could no more be regarded as something extraordinary first granted to him by an act of God. It belonged to him in himself; it was in fact based on the essence of his personality. His human existence was therefore only a stage of transition; that he might thereby be, in this concrete form, determined by his human existence, that which in himself he was already. The idea of pre-existence is now the chief point on which the further development of Christology turns. Its whole tendency is more and more to join to the state of pre-existence such predicates as remove as much as possible the distinction between God and Christ. Even the apostle Paul is advancing from the idea of pre-existence to that of creation. Though this predicate has still with him an indeterminate and ambiguous character, it was soon afterwards fixed all the more determinately. It was Paul, however, with whom Christology first took this higher flight; and this was unquestionably a consequence of the higher idea he had of the office and the work of Christ. It was he who first contemplated Christianity from a higher and more universal point of view, and recognised in it the significance of a general principle that conditioned the course of the world and the process of human development. Such being his position, the view that

Christ was a superhuman and supramundane being rose before him as a necessary pre-supposition. With this was commenced the process of elevating ever more and more the conception of Christ's person, up to absolute unity with God, and of transferring to him all the analogous features which the philosophy of the age supplied.

The Christology of the Apocalypse comes next in time to that of Paul. Here, too, the same canon holds good; for, the mightier the expected catastrophe is which is to accompany Christ's coming, the higher must be the idea formed of the person of him who is to introduce it. With this writer, as with Paul, it is through his death and resurrection that Christ arrives at the highest divine power and glory. In the ἀρνίον ἐσφαγμένον that stands before the throne of God, the greatest and the least, the contraries of life and death, of heaven and earth, are united and beheld in one and the same contemplation. Not only does Christ, in the immediate presence of God, share a like power, and dominion, and adoration with God, but predicates are given him which seem to leave no essential distinction between him and God. He is termed Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, in the same sense in which God, the ruler of all, is called ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. The new name (iii. 12) given to the Messiah, the same name of which it is said that no man knew it but he himself (xix. 12), is the unspeakable name of Jehovah. Indeed, not only are the seven spirits of God, in whom the power of the divine government that watches and rules over all is individualised, attributed to Christ (iii. 1); but he is also the ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, and the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ (iii. 14; xix. 13). But all these predicates bear a mere external relation to the person of the Messiah. He is certainly called Jehovah, or God in the highest sense; but he is merely called so,—we are not justified in inferring from the name that a truly divine nature is ascribed to him. Nor does this follow from the designation of the Messiah as the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. The λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ furnishes the point of view from which the writer regards

the whole manifestation of Jesus, the word of God being both revealed and fulfilled by him. Christianity is itself the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ (i. 9); all that composes the apocalyptic visions is the λόγοι ἀληθινοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ (xix. 9). It is Jesus who reveals the counsel of God, and who also executes it. What has been once spoken as the counsel of God must be brought to pass: here, too, Jesus is the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. To this refers the comparison of the agency of Jesus to a sharp sword going out of his mouth (xix. 15). When this sword is spoken of as going out of his mouth, it is clearly indicated that the comparison is between the sword and the word that goes out of the mouth of Jesus, the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, which he reveals; and it is a sharp sword, that is, the whole counsel of God is accomplished by him as a stern judgment with irresistible power. Accordingly, he first receives this name, the Word of God, in this passage (xix. 13), where he descends from heaven to earth as a chastising judge. The fundamental conception is the word of God, or the will and counsel of God, accomplished in the strictness of the divine judgment. The expression, then, contains nothing metaphysical, conveys nothing concerning any relation that belongs essentially to the nature of the subject in question. From this we can at once discover the sensé in which we should take the further and especially noticeable predicate given to Jesus when the Apocalypse styles him the ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ (iii. 14). Although, as the beginning of the creation, he is only the first created, this expression seems clearly enough to contain the conception of pre-existence. But if we consider, on the other hand, that immediately above (iii. 12) the name of the Messiah is called a new name, and that the pre-existence of the Messiah is not declared in plain words anywhere else in the whole book, we shall think it probable that this title is no dogmatic definition, but a mere name of honour, an enhanced expression of the idea that the Messiah is the highest creature, who was an object of attention even from the beginning, at the creation.

The peculiarity of the Christology of the Apocalypse therefore is,

that though the highest predicates are applied to Jesus, as the Messiah, they are all names given to him merely externally, not yet joined to his person with any intrinsic and essential unity. There is no intrinsic connection as yet between the divine predicates and the historical individual who is to receive them.¹ Although therefore we must not omit to notice the striking way in which the Christian consciousness felt urged, even at this period, to place the person of Jesus as high as possible, we must not the less remember that these predicates, in their whole extent, are a mere transcendental form, which still lacks a concrete matter based on the personality of Jesus himself. They are not yet indwelling features of his nature, rising out of the substantial essence of his person itself. Nothing more is implied than that Christ must have a position adequate to the great expectations concerning the last things, of which he is the chief subject. The Apocalypse embraces nothing metaphysical within its circle of vision; it takes its point of view altogether from below, and only transfers to the Messiah after his death all that gives him his divine majesty. Compare v. 12.

A further stage of development is formed by the Epistle to the Hebrews and the lesser Epistles of Paul. In their Christology Christ has come to be regarded as a being divine in himself.

The fundamental conception of the Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews is that of the Son. It is as the Son of God, in the specific sense, that Christ receives all the predicates which are here given to him. As the Son, he is the image, the immediate reflection of the glory of God, who bears the impress of the divine essence in the concrete reality of his personal existence (i. 3). He is thus, as the Son of God, placed simply above the world: he is a being essentially divine and distinct from the world. Though he has so much in common with the world that, like all things, he came forth from God, and on this account he is called *πρωτότοκος* (i. 6), still it is he who upholds all things by the word

¹ Cf. Zeller, Beiträge zur Einleitung in die Apocalypse—Theol. Jahrb. 1842 p. 709 sq.

of his power (i. 3); it is he, through whom God created the Aeons (i. 2), that is, the present and the future, or the visible and the invisible world. The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews rises so high above the human sphere, that it employs itself in the first instance with fixing more exactly the conception of the Son in his distinction from the angels, above whom the Son, as such, is far exalted. This is done by the name of Son, which belongs to him alone, as well as by the other predicates applied to him (i. 4-14).

This Christology therefore stands, speaking generally, half-way between that of Paul and that of John. However high Paul places Christ, he is still essentially man, the *δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ*: but here his original humanity is completely lost sight of, and he is transported, as a purely divine being, into the supra-material region. On the other hand, however, the Son has not yet become the Logos in the Johannine sense. He is not himself the Logos, but only upholds all things by the word of his power (i. 3). It appears strange, that the Epistle remains at this point, without going on to identify the Son with the Logos, when we observe that it personifies the Logos of God (iv. 12, 13), in a manner that naturally leads to this identification. In spite of the personification of the Logos in this passage, the two conceptions are still so little related to each other, that the divine nature of the Son is determined, not by the conception of the Logos, but by that of the Spirit. The atoning power of Christ's death is derived from his possession of the *αἰώνιον πνεῦμα* (ix. 14). He reconciles the world and God, because he offers himself to God in the element of the Spirit, because not the blood of bulls and goats, but the *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον* is the propitiation, the power which determines and makes efficacious the peculiar nature and agency of this death. What makes Christ an everlasting high priest, and gives him the power of inextinguishable life, so that the principle of life dwells in and determines his essence, is the *πνεῦμα*, the fact that he is a purely spiritual being, like God, who is himself spirit and the Father of spirits (xii. 9). At the same time, the

writer conceives the relation of the Son to the Father as one of strict subordination. The Son is so dependent on the Father, that even in that which immediately concerns the Son, the Father is the active subject. He has made the Son for a little time lower than the angels (ii. 7). Christ did not glorify himself to be made high priest, but he that said to him, "Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee:" the passage from the Psalms on which the conception of Sonship is chiefly founded (i. 5). This can only be understood of a relation fixed by the will of God; but on the other hand the expressions *ἀπαύγασμα* and *χαρακτήρ* designate it as a natural relation. Thus we find already in this Epistle the elements of those two ideas which always formed the chief antithesis in the conception of this relation. Since the Son is, in one way or the other, a being divine in himself, human existence must first be assumed by him. The author does not form any more definite conception of the incarnation. He merely speaks of Christ's becoming like men in all things,—in their moral weakness by his ability to be tempted (ii. 18), in their feebleness and finiteness by his being made lower than the angels (ii. 6-9), and above all by his ability to suffer. As this took place with a view to redemption, in order that, as an eternally appointed high priest, he might cleanse men from sin, so the whole personal being of Christ is contemplated under the idea of a process of moral development. The prayer of Jesus for rescue from destruction and death was heard because of his submission. He was brought up again from the realm of the dead (xiii. 20); received again into heaven; after he had been made lower than the angels, he was again exalted above them (iv. 14; vii. 26; i. 4); he was crowned with joy, glory, and honour (ii. 9; cf. i. 9; xii. 2), and obtained a seat at the right hand of God for ever (i. 3, 8, 13; viii. 1, 10, 12). All this makes up the notion of completion, in which, according to the view of the Epistle, beginning and end meet together. In the process performed in the person of Jesus there is merely exhibited that universal process, in which the imperfect gives way to the perfect, the present to the future, Judaism to Christianity—in which

the idea moves through its untrue form, in order to reach its true concrete reality. The idea of the high priest, prefigured in the Old Testament in the person of Melchisedec, is realised when the true high priest, who offers himself, and by his death puts an end to the imperfect Levitical priesthood, entering in by his own blood into heaven, appears before the face of God, and sits down on the right hand of the majesty on the throne of grace (ix. 11 ; x. 12).

A similar Christology is found in the lesser Epistles of Paul. Here, however, the position from which the person of Christ is viewed is more definitely speculative, metaphysical, allied to Gnosticism. Here, as in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Christ is called, in respect of his nature, which is divine in itself, the image of God (Col. i. 15). He is the reflection of God, in whom the invisible essence of God is beheld in visible form. This conception is more closely determined thus:—All things were created in him, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they are thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers. Thus all things, from the highest regions of the spiritual world to the lowest, have begun and continued to be in him. With the conception of the Son, the object is no longer merely to assign to him his definite place, in contrast to the angels; he has now the significance of a principle which stands absolutely at the head of all spiritual beings, and forms the connecting link between God and the world. On the one hand, as the first-born of the whole creation, he is placed in one series with the creature, and, though in time and rank the first-born of all that is created, he is but created by God, like all else. But on the other, inasmuch as all created things are upheld and supported by him, and have in him the substantial basis of their unity, he stands absolutely above them, and is thus absolutely distinct from the world. At the same time, his relation to the world can only be styled one of indwelling. This is what is to be understood when it is said that all was created *in* him, rather than *through* him (Col. i. 16). But the same notion is quite specially contained in a peculiar conception transferred to Christ,—that of the *πλήρωμα*, in which the indwelling relation of

Christ to the Church is merely viewed as the more concrete form of his universal relation to the world in general. This is a specific conception of the two Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians. Christ is the *πλήρωμα*, because it is first in him that God, who is in himself, quits his abstract being, and opens himself to the fulness of concrete life (Col. i. 19; ii. 9; Eph. i. 22, 23; iii. 19; iv. 13). Christ is the *πλήρωμα* in the highest and absolute sense, *ὁ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρούμενος*. He is the *πλήρωμα* of God, inasmuch as in him that which God is abstractly and ideally in himself becomes filled with its determinate concrete matter. The Church is Christ's *πλήρωμα*, as the concrete real being with which, as his matter, Christ is filled. The expression *πλήρωμα* is meant to indicate a concrete real being as the contents of another being with which it goes together to make up a unity of form and contents. As with the conception of the *πλήρωμα*, so with that of the *σῶμα*. The Church is the *σῶμα* of Christ (Eph. i. 23; iv. 12). Christ himself is also called the *σῶμα*: he is the *σῶμα* of the Godhead, inasmuch as the whole fulness of the Godhead, all that fills the idea of the Godhead with its determinate concrete matter, dwells *σωματικῶς* in him (Col. ii. 9). And if he himself is the *σῶμα* of the Godhead, the Church can only be his *σῶμα* in a more concrete sense, since, as the *σῶμα* of the Godhead, he is the head of the Church, and the principle on which the whole inwardly articulated organism of the Church depends (Eph. iv. 16; Col. ii. 19). The notions determining the relations of Christ to the Church are first endowed with their full meaning by means of the universal idea on which the Christology of these Epistles is based. Christ is the head, the principle, the central point of all things. In his person is expressed a universal idea, the form of a determinate view of the world. Now, as it belongs to the essence of the idea, that what it is in itself that it also is in reality, so the idea contained in the person of Christ must be realised in a series of determinate steps. This is done by that *ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν Χριστῷ*,—*δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν*, which is the fundamental thought of the two Epistles (Eph. i. 10; Col. i. 20). As all pro-

ceeds from him, so all is to be brought back again in him to unity. In this sense the work of Christ is regarded as consisting in the universal reconciliation and union of the universe. His activity, which redeems all, fills all with its influence, and joins the highest to the lowest, extends not only to the earth, but also to the world below, to the whole universe, in so far as it is tenanted by intelligent beings (Eph. iv. 8, *sq.*). All must be gathered together in Christ, and joined in him to that original unity in which it has in him the substantial basis of its being and continuance.

The Epistle to the Philippians moves in a similar sphere of contemplation. It distinguishes the form of God from the form of a servant; and opposes the *εἶναι ἰσα Θεῷ* to the *ὑπάρχειν ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ*, with the meaning, that Christ must accomplish in his own person a process which passes through determinate steps. When he has entered on the path of moral endeavour, and finally proved his obedience, and thus attested the divinity of his nature in itself, then, and then only, does that, which he is in himself, belong to him in truth, and in the full reality of divine being.¹

If we compare Christology, as it stands at this point of its development, with the Johannine form of the same doctrine, we shall find that no great advance needed to be made in order to reach the latter. All that was really needed was that the elements already present should be brought to a more precise conception and expression. This is done by means of the Johannine notion of the Logos.

¹ On the Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the lesser Epistles of Paul, cp. Köstlin: *Der Lehrb. des Evangeliums und der Briefe Johannis*, 1842, p. 352 *sq.*, 387 *sq.*; Schwegler: *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, ii. p. 286 *sq.*; my Paul, ii. 35 *sq.*; *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1849, p. 501 *sq.*, 1852, p. 133 *sq.* As to the Christology of the Epistle to the Philippians, and on a conception contained in it, which can only be explained by means of Gnostic ideas—the denial of a *ἀπαγμαὸς*, by which he who was existing *ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ*, but had not yet attained such identity with God as the *εἶναι ἰσα Θεῷ*, would have gained by no moral means, but directly and violently, that which he was to gain, but could only reach through moral means: as the well-known Gnostic Aeon attempted to do, in its unnatural insurrection, which, however, wrought the sudden breach between the finite and the absolute, and was, in so far, metaphysically necessary—see *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1849, p. 502 *sq.*, 1852, p. 133 *sq.*

The highest expression for the whole peculiar matter of the Christian consciousness in reference to the person of Christ is now found in the conception of the Logos. Here the same subject, which in its external and temporal manifestation is the man Jesus, is designated as an independent divine being, standing in the most immediate relation to God, nay, even as God. In the proposition (John i. 1) *Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*, the Logos is declared to be, if not the absolute God, yet a divine being. It is involved in the conception of the Logos, and the whole description given of him, that he can only be conceived as a divine being, with underived subsistence, and this is further indicated when it is said of him that he was *πρὸς τὸν Θεόν*, that he is *ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς*. The peculiar construction of *εἶναι* with *πρὸς* and *εἰς* and the accusative is intended to designate the being of the Logos with God as not merely quiescent, but active. The Logos is in a constant activity and movement, whose object is God. His indwelling relation to God is expressed in this, that, as the *ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς*, he is, as it were, he who moves towards the heart of God, and seeks to put away all that divides and distinguishes him from God, in unity with him. This presupposes, however, that he is conscious of his personal distinction from God. His relation to God is at once, and equally, distinction in unity, and unity in distinction. His absolute essence consists in the intimate union of these two necessary elements.

There is only one mode of explaining the fact that that divine majesty, which the Christian consciousness connected with the person of Jesus, found so direct and simple an expression in the conception of the Logos. The Logos-idea cannot have been at all strange to the time and the locality in which the Gospel of John appeared. If we bear in mind the importance of the Logos-idea in the Alexandrian religious philosophy of this time, we shall see that it is against all historical analogy to suppose that the ideas of the age, and among them the wide-spread Logos-idea, contributed nothing to guide the evangelist to his doctrine of the Logos. It is, however, true that he could not borrow the matter of the idea of

the Logos from the current philosophy. It could not have occurred to him to transfer this conception to Christ, had it not already become a standing part of the Christian consciousness that Christ was to be placed, in respect of his higher dignity, in such a relation of identity to God as the Logos-conception expresses. The process can therefore be only thus stated: If the higher dignity attributed by the Christian consciousness to Christ was to be brought to a precise conception and expression, the Logos-conception, it seemed, offered the most effectual means of doing this. Its adoption for this purpose may have been further commended by the fact that Christian doctrine, of which Jesus is the author, was called *ὁ λόγος Θεοῦ*, or simply *ὁ Λόγος*. Already in the Apocalypse Jesus is called the *λόγος Θεοῦ*. The meaning "word," i.e. "organ of revelation," must be kept in view in the conception of the Logos, since *λόγος* only means "reason" in so far as thinking is also speaking. But the Gospel of John also bears a very close relation to the Gnostic circle of ideas, and in particular to the Gnostic doctrine of Aeons, in which similar conceptions, such as *λόγος*, *φῶς*, *πλήρωμα*, *χάρις*, *ἀλήθεια*, occur in a quite analogous connection. Here again, however, the original Christian mode of view shows its peculiar and practical character. It puts aside all those multifarious ideas, with which Gnostic fancy and speculation filled the supramaterial world, holds fast only the simple conception of the Logos, and gathers together in it all that the Christian mind was to consider the highest expression of its view of Christ's person. But however precisely we may distinguish between form and matter in the Johannine Logos-conception, with regard to previously-existing elements, there is ultimately only one explanation of the reception of this idea into the Johannine Christology, viz., that the author held the same position, as to the absolute idea of God, which was held by the Alexandrian religious philosophy and by Christian Gnosticism. The Logos-idea, in its higher sense, only finds its proper place in systems which remove the idea of God, as he exists in pure abstraction, apart and self-contained, to so transcendental a

distance, that the relation between God and the world can only be constituted by an organ of revelation such as the Logos. Further, the more transcendental the whole mode of contemplation is, the more surely, here as with Philo, are opposite ideas confronted without any link of connection. On the one hand, the whole significance of the Logos rests on the distinctness of his essence from God, which is due to the impossibility of an immediate contact between the highest God and the finite. On the other hand, it is necessary to assert his identity with God, in order that he may communicate the divine to the world.¹

The evangelist himself states very plainly how absolutely he conceives the idea of God (i. 18). No one has seen God at any time; for the essence of God, absolutely exalted above all that is finite, is of its own nature invisible, and God and Spirit are simply identical conceptions (iv. 24). It follows from this transcendency of God, that a special being, who shall effect a communication between him and the world, is necessarily required. Such is the Logos, in his God-revealing function. This function he can only fulfil as possessing an immediate unity with God. As the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, and as such alone, can he reveal and declare that which, without him, is hidden away from men in the absolute and self-contained essence of God. In this identity with God, he is the only begotten Son (i. 14, 18). Since he is expressly termed God, the predicate "Son," which is given to him, can only refer to that community of essence which exists between him and God. The conception of Son necessarily involves the conception of generation. The world,

¹ Cp. Zeller, *die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2, p. 321; Wolff, *die Philonische Philosophie in ihren Hauptmomenten*, 2d ed. Gothenburg, 1858, p. 20: "In the Logos the absolute which is in itself makes itself an object, becomes concrete, a Spirit with life in himself: whereas, apprehended merely on the side of being, he is abstract God, form without matter. Being is only the one constituent of the divine; the divine is not completed till the other constituent is added, namely, the Logos, in which God appears as Spirit, as living creative Spirit. The divine becomes another to itself; yet this other is nothing strange to it, nothing separate from it, but is in it." God is essentially both the two at once; but the two stand apart and unconnected.

with all that is, was made by him : he, on the contrary, was not made, but begotten ; and the term "Son of God" has accordingly quite a different sense in the Gospel of John from that which the Synoptics give it. What those who were born of God (i. 13, 14) are relatively, that he, as the only begotten of God, is absolutely. Therefore God is his Father in quite a special and peculiar sense (v. 18 ; x. 36). Unity and equality with God are the basis of this relation. So completely is the Logos, as the Son, one with the Father, that he is indeed only the concrete manifestation of the Father. He who sees him sees the Father (xiv. 9) : he and the Father are one (x. 30 ; cp. 38, and xvii. 21). Though the Father and the Logos, or the Son, are two distinct persons, and have each his own personal self-consciousness, yet the personal distinction is taken away by this, that each recognises and knows his own personal ego in the ego of the other. The moral unity—for such is the fittest term—which binds the two together, makes that which is in truth a part of their essence to be also their voluntary action. This part of their essence, and this action, is that each so fully resigns his own self to that of the other, that he knows himself one with him, and his own self-consciousness is absorbed in that of the other. By virtue of this unity of essence and will, the Logos or the Son, in his human manifestation, is endowed with truly divine attributes. As the Father has life in himself, absolutely and originally, so the Son has life in himself, absolutely and originally, given to him by the Father (v. 26). The fulness of the Father's power is his also : he works with it (v. 19 *sq.*) ; similarly, his knowledge is without limit (i. 49 *sq.* ; ii. 25 ; iv. 19 ; vi. 64 ; xi. 4, 14).

The Logos, in this unity with God, is the highest organ of revelation. But while he performs this revealing function in the world, and also works as the principle of the life and the light of men, he has an antithesis in darkness. And the more deeply he enters into the world where the two principles, light and darkness, are opposed, the more does the other side of his being, viz., all the finiteness and humanity which belongs to him in distinction

from God, come into view. He is not only the light which shines in darkness, he has also become flesh, and submits to all the consequences of a fleshly manifestation. His becoming flesh forms the transition from the eternal Logos, existing apart and in himself, to the historical Messiah who appeared in the person of Jesus. And here, more than at any other point, we are forced to observe how different and incommensurable are the two factors which make up the Logos-idea, and how real is the distinction between the Johannine and the synoptical Christology. While the latter fixes the first entry of the Messiah into existence at the time at which the πνεῦμα ἅγιον descended upon him, and marks the birth of Jesus, in the most unmistakable manner, as the starting-point of the whole Gospel history, the Gospel of John, on the contrary, contents itself with laying simply down: ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. Although the directness of this expression seems to repel analysis, it cannot conceal the disparity of the human and the divine elements in the Johannine Christ. While the term σὰρξ, according to its true meaning, obliges us to suppose that the Logos assumed a body, on the other hand, the words σὰρξ ἐγένετο, when taken in connection with the train of thought contained in the prologue of the Gospel, can only be regarded as a subordinate detail. The Logos, from the beginning, is so truly the same identical subject, that it is not possible, during the whole course of its agency, for any new cause to enter and make it become, now for the first time, this subject, or any other subject than it has been before. His presence in the world is already given in full reality in his shining as the light in the darkness. As he is the same subject from the beginning, so those who by faith become one with him stand, both before and after, in the same relation of sonship to God. His becoming flesh is but the highest manifestation of his glory, for those who receive him. The σὰρξ ἐγένετο has therefore by no means the significance which, as being the very act of incarnation, it might seem to possess; it is merely an accident of the changeless personality of the Logos. The identity of the Logos with the historical person of Jesus having been

simply laid down as a fact in the words *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, the essential theme of the whole Gospel history is the self-manifestation of the Logos. The Logos, identical with the person of Jesus, manifests himself in the works, the teaching, and the death of Jesus; and the point everywhere is, that he should be recognised as that which he truly is. This self-manifestation of Jesus as the Logos is also his continuous glorification; and the most important stage of this glorification is the death of Jesus. In the Johannine Gospel the resurrection is identified with the coming of the Lord in the Spirit, and so receives a spiritualised meaning, and thus in this Gospel the end and the beginning are most intimately connected. Jesus goes back to the Father, from whom he came forth, thither where he was before (vi. 62). Before, when he had not yet entered into the world and become flesh, he was the purely divine Logos, who had not yet become flesh; and he must afterwards be the same. It thus follows necessarily that—since the Spirit alone quickens, but the flesh profits nothing (vi. 63)—he puts off the earthly veil of flesh which he had assumed, in order that he may resume his true and pure being, in immediate unity with the Father, with whom, as he is himself Spirit in the highest absolute sense (iv. 24), only the spiritual can be one.¹

So powerful, even at this date, is the tendency to regard the whole manifestation and personality of Jesus from the point of view of his supramaterial being, and to subordinate his humanity to his deity to such an extent, that all the reality of his personal existence falls on the side of the divinity, or (if this expression be too strong) the two sides of his nature stand perfectly apart and unharmonised. So soon as the Christian consciousness had attached itself firmly, as in this Gospel, to the Logos idea, the point was reached, from which Christian dogma could grow and develop in its peculiar determinate direction, till it reached the full body of Christian doctrine. Even at the middle of the second century, however, this idea, with the essential definitions and limitations furnished by the Johannine doctrine, is by no

¹ Comp. my *Kritischen Untersuchungen über die Kanon. Evang.* p. 77 sq.

means so firmly established, that it may be taken as the objective expression of the general dogmatic consciousness, as certainly would have been the case had the fourth Gospel been generally known from the end of the first century. On the contrary, the dogma of that period continues to waver between various views, till in the second half of the second century the Logos-idea, in its Johannine form, gradually wins its way to predominance. The following stages of thought deserve notice:—

1. The principal conception which is used to denote the divine element in Christ's person is not λόγος, but πνεῦμα; the word πνεῦμα sometimes denoting the spiritual principle which forms a proper and invariable part of the essence of God; sometimes an angel,—that is, one of the beings in whom the spiritual principle assumes an individual existence with a concrete form. The former conception occurs in the Epistles of Clement of Rome, where the divine and human elements in Christ are distinguished as spirit and body;¹ and this view is also partly adopted by the Epistle of Barnabas. The latter signification seems to prevail in the Shepherd of Hermas; the Son of God, who is more ancient than every creature, who at the creation stood counselling by the side of the Father, who holds and supports the whole creation, is called spiritus sanctus, but only in the same sense in which the angels are spiritus sancti.² The idea that the pre-existent subject which appeared in Jesus was an angel, was very wide-spread and popular in the ancient church, and also belonged peculiarly to Ebionitism; even with Justin the doctrine of angels is very closely connected with Christology.³ It was thus natural that the incarnation should be conceived solely as the assumption of a body, and the body as the vessel in which the Spirit dwells.⁴

¹ Cp. the second Epistle of Clem. Rom. ad Cor. cap. ix. and the Epistle of Barnabas, cap. vii.

² Simil. ix. 12, v. 2 sq.

³ Cp. Justin, Apol. i. 6; Hermas Simil. v. 6; Epiph. Haer. xxx. 3, 16.

⁴ Upon this form of early Christology, and the data thereon, cp. the dissertation of J. Helweg, Die Vorstellung von der Präexistenz Christi in der ältesten Kirche, Theol. Jahrb. 1848, 144 sq.; Hilgenfeld, die apostol. Väter, 169 sq.

2. Even when the Logos-idea begins to be applied to Christ, it appears in so uncertain and indefinite a form, that we can scarcely go so far as to identify it with the Johannine conception. We are not to regard it as a distinct dogmatic statement when we find Clement of Rome saying, in his first Epistle, that God *ἐν λόγῳ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ συνεστήσατο τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐν λόγῳ δύναται αὐτὰ καταστρέψαι*, although *λόγος τῆς μεγαλωσύνης*, as well as *σκηπτρον τῆς μεγαλωσύνης* (cap. 16), and *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ* (cap. 36), can only signify Christ. Again, it is only the want of a more precise determination of the Logos-idea that can explain such a doctrine as we find in the pseudo-Ignatian Epistles, which even makes God, in a Patripassian sense, the subject directly identical with Christ.¹ When, however, in the same Epistles, Christ is not only said to have come forth from the one Father, and to go back to him, but also, as the Son of God, through whom the one God has revealed himself, is called his *λόγος ἀίδιος, οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθὼν*, we are brought very near to the Johannine doctrine.² We are therefore surprised, when we come to Justin, to find that with him the Logos-idea, though very familiar to him, differs widely from the form which it bears in the fourth Gospel. Christ, or the Son of God, is with Justin a being numerically or personally distinct from God; he is begotten by the Father, or (in accordance with the doctrine of emanation) has come forth from him as fire is kindled by fire without lessening of substance; he is the first-born of the whole creation, who was with the Father before the creation, through whom the Father has made all things; he is himself God. Yet notwithstanding all these predicates, he is so subordinate to the Father, that he is merely classed among the intermediate beings through whose agency God works, and is expressly called the servant of the Creator. The term *λόγος*, far from specifically denoting Christ, is only one among the many diverse appellations which are indis-

¹ Ad Ephes. i., ad Rom. vi. Cp. my work on the Ignatian Epistles, in opposition to Bunsen, p. 108 *sq.*

² Ad Ephes. vii. 19; ad Magnes. vii. 8.

criminally applied to this divine being of the second rank.¹ It thus appears that the Logos-idea was current and well known in the Christian Church at the time of Justin; but the writings of the same Father also show plainly that the true and original source of the current conception was not the Gospel of John. It would otherwise be quite inconsistent with the weighty significance which he attached to the idea, that he should utterly ignore the supreme authority of the Gospel in this direction. Though we do not allege that this silence was caused by the non-existence of the Gospel, it can only have arisen from want of acquaintance with it; and this again cannot be explained, if we suppose that the Gospel had long been credited with apostolic authenticity.

3. But not only did the Logos-idea give an exact dogmatic determination of the conception which was connected with the divine majesty of Christ: it contained an element which involved a definite distinction between the Christian and the Jewish consciousness of God. So long as the divine element in Christ was conceived under the indeterminate notion of the Spirit, or in the form of angelology, there was no danger of a collision with the strictly monarchian Jewish idea of God. But when the Logos-idea appeared, notwithstanding that it was an outcome of the Alexandrian philosophy of religion, such an antagonism was inevitable. It is an essential part of the Johannine doctrine of the Logos, that he is God; and even Justin, though he has a much lower view of the Logos, expressly sets forth that he is God.² Now this is the point at which an opposition arose between the two forms of Christology—one of which continued Jewish, while the other was developing into Catholic dogma. Thus the Christology of the pseudo-Clementine Homilies at once states the Judaistic view of Christ's person in its most developed form, and not less characteristically seizes, in all its sharpness, the point at which the Christology that rests on the Logos-idea seems to infringe the

¹ Cf. Helweg, 258 *sq.* Hilgenfeld, *Krit. Unters. über die Evang. Justin's, etc.*, 1850, 297 *sq.* Das *Evang. und die Briefe Joh.* 1849, 130 *sq.*

² *Apol. i.* 63: ὁς καὶ λόγος πρωτότοκος ὢν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Θεὸς ὑπάρχει.

monarchy of God, and simply refuses to recognise a son of God who is himself God. According to the Homilies, the Lord, as he did not teach other Gods besides the Creator, so likewise did not call himself God; and rightly named him blessed, who called him the Son of God, of the Creator of the Universe.¹ We can fancy ourselves transported into the time of the Arian controversies, when, in the same passage of the Homilies, the antithetical conceptions of "unbegotten" and "begotten" are applied to determine the distinction between the Father and the Son in such a way that the two are separated by a gulf which cannot be bridged over. As the Son is thus simply another than the Father, the same name of God may not be given to him; for the begotten cannot have a like name with the unbegotten, even though the begotten be of like essence with the begetter. The name of God is only to belong to that which is peculiar to him, and simply incommunicable. The Johannine principle of the Godhead of the Logos, to which alone this polemic can refer, thus possessed no authority for those who adhered firmly to the strict Jewish conception of God. It is therefore clear that the Logos-idea belongs to a religious sphere in which the barriers of the Jewish consciousness of God had widely given way. Still, by the Johannine doctrine, the Son, or the Logos held to be God, had been so subordinated to the infinitely greater Father, that the distinction between the two was sufficiently broad. Nevertheless, so soon as they were placed on such an equality, though but in one point, as the common name expresses, the goal of the further development of dogma was at once indicated, and the movement that had once begun could not pause, till their identity was thought out and established on every side as thoroughly as possible.

We have thus given a general indication of the direction in which the dogma of the Godhead of Christ proceeded in its further course under the guidance of the Logos-idea. It was under this idea, as a general fundamental form, that the divine element of Christ was now conceived; it was by means of this that the dogmatic consciousness sought to establish more precisely the different

¹ Hom. xvi. 15.

points which are contained in that conception. Though it cannot be shown that Justin was acquainted with the fourth Gospel, the influence of the Johannine Logos-idea can be traced, ever more clearly and definitely, in his immediate successors, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus. But the idea has two sides: the first of these, the identity of the Logos with the Father, is confronted by the second and not less important one, viz., the personality of the Logos himself. It is the latter of these two sides that these Fathers chiefly labour to define. If the Logos was the Son of God, and if the Son was to be conceived in the full reality of his existence as such, it was necessary to gain a definite notion of his commencement. The Logos, as the Son, could only have originated or have been begotten from the essence of God. This origination must have taken place at a definite point of time; and this could only be the same time at which all things first entered on existence. The same creative word which called all things into existence is also the word of God, on which rests the conception of the Logos as the Son. Again, though the Logos, as the Son, originated at a definite point of time, and by a determinate act of God, still it is possible to suppose that he existed before that time as the Logos, and afterwards assumed a different sort of existence as the Son. The twofold meaning of the word Logos, in fact, led of itself to the distinction of the *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and the *λόγος προφορικὸς*, which Theophilus first made part of accepted terminology. The general relation in which the indwelling thought stands to the spoken word, or the idea, as it is apart and in itself, to its realisation, became the fundamental view which was used for conceiving the relation of the Father and the Son. Now, the outward word which proceeds from the inward thought, or the idea in the course of its self-realisation, could only be conceived after the analogy of a natural process, in which life is begotten from life; and God, as the primal substance and the primal power of all being and all life, has the natural impulse to produce something else from himself, or to send forth something in emanation. Thus the theory of emanation and subordination

took shape. Here the matter of principal importance was that the emanations and projections of the divine essence in the succession of the Father and the Son, in which the Holy Spirit was naturally included as a third member, should be so marked off and defined in a Trinitarian sense, as not to form too continuous a series with the remainder of created beings. The chief representative of this most material and concrete form of the idea of the Trinity is Tertullian.¹

But the deeply material character of this idea could not fail to call forth a counter movement. The point at which, above all, an excessive materialisation of the idea of God must be checked, was the divine act of the begetting of the Son; for here the categories of temporal origination and growth, and the same material affections which the Gnostic theories were charged with supposing, were introduced into the essence of God. It can therefore be only regarded as a reaction against the too material form which the Logos-idea assumed when doctors of the Church, as Athenagoras and Irenaeus, abstained entirely from fixing the procession of the Son from the Father as a special ingredient of the conception of their relation. But since it is on this very constituent that the personal subsistence of the Son depends, the distinction is too much thrown into the background by these Fathers in comparison with the unity; the Son has too little disengaged himself from identity with the Father. Those who felt a decided disinclination (as the Alexandrians especially did) to all anthropomorphisms and emanational ideas, could not but feel it most difficult to hold fast to the distinction of the Son from the Father, as the conception of the two, as personally different beings, required. This is seen more remarkably in Clement of Alexandria than in any other doctor. In the lofty and transcendental predicates which he applies to the Son, we have simply a reflection of the absolute essence of the Father,

¹ Here (as well as with the following) comp. my *Geschichte der Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit*, i. 163 *sq.*, where these points are developed in more detail, and the references are given.

and the character of the Logos as the agent of mediation between God and the world almost disappears in his unity with God. The antithesis of the two dominant views was presented in its sharpest form in the abstract and in fact purely negative Alexandrian conception of God on the one hand, and the material realism of a Tertullian on the other. Tertullian, indeed, could only conceive the essence of God as a bodily substance. In accordance with this antithesis the two leading notions, which had to be combined in unity in the conception of the Son, viz., his personal subsistence and his identity with the Father, fell out of connection with each other. The Son believed in was either personally indistinguishable from the Father; or, even though he was begotten or sent forth by emanation from the Father's essence, still, as having had a commencement in time, and being deeply subordinated to the Father, he belonged to the class of created beings.

That the Son must be both together—one with the Father, as well as personally distinct from him—this doctrine had acquired, even at the time of Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement (although these doctors did not perfectly agree), a growing predominance, and even laid a certain claim to church authority. This, however, can only be said in a limited sense. These doctors were opposed by others, who could by no means reconcile themselves to the idea of a lesser God, who had proceeded from God and assumed an enduring personal subsistence. The name of "monarchians" will characterise their standpoint as that of abstract Jewish monotheism. All emanational ideas, all suppositions of an inward distinction and living process in God, all that the church doctors, in the spirit of the theology which they raised on the basis of a plurality of divine essences, denoted by the term "economy," is here kept at a distance. Besides monotheistic tendencies, other forces also contributed to give these teachings such importance that during the whole of the third century it remained doubtful which mode of thought would at last gain the ascendant.

One of the first in the series of these monarchians is Praxeas.

He is only known to us from the work written by Tertullian against him; strangely enough, he is neither mentioned by Theodoret nor by the author of the *Philosophoumena*—though, as a heretic who had appeared in Rome, he cannot have been unknown to the latter—nor by any other doctor. According to Tertullian, he distinguished the divine and human elements in Christ only as spirit and flesh. The same subject is as spirit the Father, as flesh the Son. Here, as wherever the divine in Christ is merely made to consist in a *πνεῦμα* identical with the essence of God, and the *σὰρξ* is regarded as the natural correlative of the *πνεῦμα*, Patripassianism, as it is called, is the inevitable consequence. Nor did Praxeas himself deny Patripassianism: only he did not wish to speak simply of a *patri* of the Father, but only of a *compatri* of the Father with the Son. This *compatri* is in fact a natural conclusion from his theory; for the Father as the Spirit could only suffer through the interposing medium of the flesh, as the Spirit bound up with the flesh, or as the subject identical with the Son. Comparing the doctrine of Praxeas, as stated by Tertullian, with that of Callistus, as given by the author of the *Philosophoumena*, we find that the two completely coincide. Callistus appeared in Rome as a disciple of Cleomenes,¹ and Noetus under the Roman bishop Zephyrinus. Like Praxeas, Callistus affirmed that the Father and the Son were different only in name, but in themselves one, the indivisible Spirit; the Spirit that became flesh in the Virgin was not anything else than the Father, but one and the same. Therefore it was said in John xiv. 11, "Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me?" That which is seen as man is the Son: the Spirit, who has taken up his station in the Son, is the Father; for the Father and the Son are not two Gods, but one; for he who in him became the Father took the flesh, and through union with him made it God, and bound it to unity with him: the one God is called Father

¹ This Cleomenes himself was the disciple of a certain Epigonus, who τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπιδημήσας as the δούκωνος καὶ μαθητῆς of Noetus of Smyrna ἐπίσπειρε τὴν ἁθρόν γνῶμην. Philos. ix. 7, p. 279.

and Son; this one person cannot be two, and so the Father suffered together with the Son.¹ The chief point is that not only are the Father and the Son identified, but God and Spirit are taken as simply identical conceptions. The Father and the Son, joined like spirit and flesh, and therefore without the connecting link of the Logos, meet in Jesus in unity of person.

Noetus of Smyrna, however, is better known than Praxeas. His historical significance is derived chiefly from the fact that he is the forerunner of Sabellius. Whatever classification of the monarchians be assumed, the guiding thought which is common to Noetus and Sabellius joins them closely together. This is not the doctrine of monotheism, but a philosophical view of the world, such as is usually denoted by the general name of pantheism. Those church writers—for instance, the author of the *Philosophoumena*—who not only derive everything heretical from Greek philosophy, but also think that every heresy must be referred to a particular philosophical system, consider the doctrine of Heraclitus and that of Noetus so closely allied, that they even call the second a pupil of the first. As Heraclitus regarded nature as the harmony of contraries, as the universal unity, in which, though in external appearance one thing ever stands opposed to another, all contraries are in fact removed and raised into unity; as he is said to have laid down concerning the universe, that it is both subject to and exempt from destruction, that it is both originated and unoriginated, both mortal and immortal;²—so Noetus is said to have

¹ Philos. ix. 12, p. 289. οὕτως τὸν πατέρα συμπεπονθέναι τῷ υἱῷ, οὐ γὰρ θέλει λέγειν τὸν πατέρα πεπονθέναι. Tertullian says exactly the same of Praxeas. Cp. *Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit*, i. p. 251. Praxeas also appealed to John xiv. 11; Tert. adv. Prax. cap. 20.

² Philos. ix. 9, p. 280: Ἡράκλειτος μὲν οὖν φησιν εἶναι τὸ πᾶν διαυρετὸν ἀδιαίρετον, γενητὸν ἀγένητον, θνητὸν ἀθάνατον, λόγον, αἰῶνα, πατέρα υἱόν, θεὸν δίκαιον. These words are not literally found in any of the fragments hitherto known, though those given by Schleiermacher in his dissertation on Heraclitus (Nos. 38 and 51 Philos. und Vermischt. Schriften, ii. pp. 80 and 122) contain some similar expressions. But the word φησιν, often indefinitely used in the *Philosoph.*, need not here be taken to indicate a literal quotation. The Philos. (ix. 10, p. 281) consider the essential part of the doctrine of Heraclitus to be, that he ἐν ἴσῃ μοίρᾳ τίθεται καὶ τιμᾷ τὰ ἐμφανῆ τοῖς ἀφανέσιν, ὡς ἔν τι τὸ ἐμφανὲς καὶ τὸ ἀφανές

thought it not illogical to hold, that the same subject unites in itself opposite determinations, that as the Father it is invisible, unoriginated, immortal, but as the Son the opposite of all this, that God as the Father and the Son is both the one and the other, when and how he will. Noetus based this assertion, apparently, on a conception of the world, according to which the one essence of God both goes forth into the ever-varying diverse multitude of phenomena, and out of it back again into himself. But the general view which underlay the teaching of Noetus, and perhaps that of Praxeas before him, is first presented plainly in the teaching of Sabellius.

For a correct conception of the doctrine of Sabellius (which Neander also has stated incorrectly in an essential point), the chief requisite is to grasp the meaning which, in distinction from his predecessors, he assigned to the Logos-idea. The peculiarity of Praxeas and Noetus is that they make God become Father of the Son without the interposing link of the Logos. Sabellius, in his development of the idea of the Trinity, on the other hand, not

ὁμολογουμένως ὑπάρχον. This is the chief point of contact between Heraclitus and Noetus. The doctrine of the latter is thus stated, *Philos.* p. 234: *ὅτε μὲν οὖν μὴ γεγέννητο ὁ πατήρ* (so long as the One had not yet become the Father of the Son) *δικαίως πατήρ προσηγορεύτο* (he was rightly called the Father of the world). Cp. 283: *λέγουσι—ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Θεὸν εἶναι πάντων δημιουργὸν καὶ πατέρα, ὅτε δὲ ἡυδόκησεν γενέσθιν ὑπομείναι, γεννηθεὶς ὁ υἱὸς ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ οὐχ ἑτέρου.* *Οὕτως γὰρ δοκεῖ μοναρχίαν συνιστᾶν, ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ φάσκων ὑπάρχειν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν—αὐτὸν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ, ὀνόματι μὲν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν καλούμενον κατὰ χρόνων τροπήν.* In this *τροπή χρόνων* is involved the fundamental view of the Sabellian *πρόσωπα*. In order to express the unity of the Father and the Son, of the Invisible and the Visible, in the strongest terms, the author of the *Philos.* adds also (284): *Τοῦτον πάθει ξύλον προσπαγέντα, καὶ ἑαυτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα παραδόντα, ἀποθανόντα καὶ μὴ ἀποθανόντα, καὶ ἑαυτὸν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήσαντα, τὸν ἐν μνημεῖῳ ταφέντα καὶ λόγῳ τρωθέντα, καὶ ἥλοις καταπαγέντα τοῦτον τὸν ὅλων Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα εἶναι λέγει Κλεομένης καὶ ὁ τούτων χόρος, Ἡρακλείτειον σκότος ἐπεισάγοντες πολλοῖς.* The distinguishing feature of the doctrine of Noetus, thus considered, would therefore be, that he predicated of the person of Jesus, regarded as a particular individual, that which was laid down by Heraclitus of the *pân*, the whole of things, the world in general. While the doctrine thus worked out by Heraclitus, the unity of contraries, was quite defensible, Noetism only shows a phenomenon that often recurs in the history of Christology: viz., that when the universal has been substituted for the individual in the person of Jesus, this new subject is thought not to efface, but to maintain, and include, his personality.

only assumes the Logos-idea—now become an essential and determining part of the thought of the age—but even makes it his principle.¹ The characteristic of Sabellianism is first that it distinguishes a monad and a triad, and then the mode in which the former passes into the latter. The means of connection between them, the principle of motion, by which the monad passes into a triad, is the Logos. With Sabellius the Logos holds by no means his usual position. Usually he is represented as proceeding from the Father, in order to become the Son: with Sabellius he precedes the whole Trinity, and thus even the Father, as the first member of the triad, presupposes the Logos. For this very reason, since all which is, first enters on existence in the triad, the Logos is not here a self-subsistent being, but only the transition to being, being in the course of origination, the principle of creative motion.² The monas is the first and original principle, which is necessarily presupposed by everything originated, which is in itself, and, as simple unity, includes in itself all. The monad must be carefully distinguished from the Father; otherwise the proper point of view for observing Sabellianism will be completely missed. That which is hidden in the monad, as in unity, must come forth and be revealed. In this sense Sabellius spoke of a silent and a speaking, or an inactive and an active God. The speaking God

¹ The doctrine of Sabellius is the advance from the duad to the triad. Originally there was no difference between Sabellianism and Noetism. The *vionάρωρ*, Son-Father, a term used to denote the former (Gieseler, K.-G. i. 1, p. 299) is Noetus's merely nominal distinction between the Father and the Son. We learn from the Philos. some personal details concerning Sabellius. Cp. Volkmar, *Hippolytus und die römischen Zeitgenossen*; Zürich, 1855, p. 122.

² The most remarkable point of contact between Heraclitus on the one hand, and Noetus and Sabellius on the other, is the conception of the Logos. What the Logos is with Sabellius, as the moving creative principle, that is with Heraclitus the *διὰ πάντων διήκων λόγος*, the all-pervading law of reason, whose essence-matter and true significance is the law of contraries, the identity of being and not-being, as it subsists in a process of movement which continually changes into the absolute contrary of these its two factors, and, doing so, ever remains identical with itself,—which movement forms the idea of becoming. This is in accordance with Lassalle's definition of the Heraclitean Logos. *Die Philosophie Herakleitos, des Dunkeln*, von Ephesus; Berlin, 1858, vol. i. p. 322 sq.; cp. pp. 281, 259; vol. ii. p. 263 sq.

can only be the Logos in his relation to the Monad; but Sabellius's meaning would be quite perverted if his Logos were taken to signify merely the creative word sent forth in one single utterance. On the contrary, as he said of the God who is in himself, who is in substance one and the same, but assumes different forms as different occasions require, that he at one time expresses himself (*διαλέγεσθαι*) as the Father, at another as the Son, at another as the Holy Spirit,¹ it is clear that he did not understand by the Logos the mere act of creation; but that he regarded the whole process of world-development, running its course in the three forms of his idea of the Trinity, as one and the same Logos, as a continuous speech, as a divine dialectic activity which passes through different successive stages. As, then, the Logos is the principle of the origination and development of the world, so the God who is immanent in the world first attains real existence in the world. The world-development is the Trinitarian process, in which the God who is essentially one shows himself forth as Father, Son, and Spirit, appearing in the concrete reality of his being in these three determinate forms, constituting so many stages in the course of the universe.

This is the conception of *πρόσωπα*. The immanent relation of God and the world, Sabellius's fundamental view, is here observable; the three *πρόσωπα* can only be conceived as successive, not as simultaneous. As the world undergoes change and takes a different character from one period to another, so does God likewise in each period assume a different countenance, as it were altering his form, and showing himself forth as Father, Son, and Spirit, ever varying in the determinations of his personality. Each *πρόσωπον* is a different *διαλέγεσθαι*, and the three *πρόσωπα* together are, therefore, only the conception of the Logos unfolding and declaring itself. With regard to the several *πρόσωπα*, it is very characteristic of Sabellius's mode of view that (as it is

¹ Basilii (Ep. 210) brings out the specially characteristic element of Sabellius's doctrine:—*τὸν αὐτὸν θεὸν ἓνα τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ ὄντι, πρὸς τὰς ἐκάστοτε παραπιπτούσας χρείας μεταμορφούμενον, νῦν μὲν ὡς πατέρα, νῦν δὲ ὡς υἱόν, νῦν δὲ ὡς πνεῦμα ἅγιον διαλέγεσθαι*, citing these as the words of Sabellius himself.

expressly stated¹) he did not ascribe the creation, but only the giving of the law, to the Father. Since it is through the Logos alone that the silent God progresses to speech, the creation, as the transition from being to becoming, as the beginning of the divine activity whose object is the world, can only belong to the Logos-conception. When the world exists, and not till then, the series of *πρόσωπα* which form the Trias can unfold itself. The first period or phase of the world's history, viz., that of the Old Testament, is the *πρόσωπον* of the Father. In the second period the same God appears in the person of the Son. He was discerned in the first as the Father and the Lawgiver; it is now the incarnation of the Logos that gives this epoch its peculiar character. We might perhaps infer that the Logos stands in another and more immediate relation to the *πρόσωπον* of the Son than to the two other *πρόσωπα*. He is, however, in the *πρόσωπον* of the Father, the same working principle: the law-giving of the Father and the incarnation of the Son are alike his work: in the one, as in the other, the Logos assumes a part in the development of history; nothing but the form under which he appears is changed. The same is the case with the third *πρόσωπον*. The divine-human unity, which shows itself forth in the incarnate Logos as in the one individual with whom the Logos has combined himself in personal unity,—this divine-human unity, in the third *πρόσωπον*, as the form of the Holy Spirit, is manifested in the whole multitude of the faithful or spiritual: each of these is relatively that which the Son, as the one God-man, is absolutely. God, in this series of *πρόσωπα*, the various phases of his revelation, joins himself more and more closely to the world and humanity. Accordingly, the third *πρόσωπον*, in which, in the form of the Holy Spirit, God unites himself with men, and each individual is severally conscious of his unity with God, is not only the most universal, but the most intense and unqualified interpenetration of the divine and human. Here, too, the working principle is the Logos as the

¹ According to Theodoret, Haer. fab. ii. 9, Sabellius ascribed to the Father in the Old Testament only the *νομοθεῖν*.

speaking God. As, in the *πρόσωπον* of the Son, he is man in the one individual, so in the third *πρόσωπον* he individualises himself in the infinitely manifold variety of single subjects. The whole process of the revelation and unfolding of the divine essence, immanent in the world, is finally completed when the Logos goes back into God, as he had come forth from him. From the whole structure of Sabellius's theory, we should certainly be led to suppose, even were it not expressly attested, that he affirmed a final return of the Logos, in which all reaches its end. Since his fundamental idea is thus the process in which the essence of God expands and again contracts itself, the ancient doctors, for instance Athanasius,¹ thought that the source of his doctrine was to be found in the Stoic philosophy. In affirming this, they spoke with the same degree of justice with which they referred Noetism and Sabellianism to the philosophy of Heraclitus. For the Stoic and the Heraclitean doctrines stand in a relation of the closest affinity; and from the latter especially came the idea of a process which passes into opposing antithesis and receives everything back, out of antithesis, into unity of principle, or moves between being and becoming, unity and duality, expansion and contraction, etc. This ancient conception of the world became very widely spread, and meets us also in other Christian writings of this age.²

This school of Monarchians, if their doctrine is followed out to the point where its essential tendency becomes most clearly discernible, can only be styled pantheistic. It is this that distinguishes them from another school, who, though they also rejected a hypostatic Trinity in the sense of the Catholic doctors, otherwise took a different direction. From a pantheistic point of view, only the divine element of Christ can be regarded as the substance of his person; the divine manifests itself in the human element, but the latter is a mere accident of the former. The opposite standpoint was, that the human was regarded as the

¹ Orat. c. Ar. iv. 13. Cf. Greg. Naz. Or. i. ed. Par. 1619, i. 16.

² In the pseudo-Clementine Homilies; in the Apocryphal Gospel of the Egyptians. Cp. Schneckenburger, über das Ev. der Aegyptier, 1834, pp. 3, 8.

substance, and the divinity which forms a part of the conception of Christ's person, added to it only as something secondary and subordinate. This was done by the second school of Monarchians. The ancient doctors denoted their opinions by the characteristic expression that they taught a Christ *κάτωθεν*; i.e. a Christ who comes from below, being essentially a mere man, and only possessing divinity in so far as his divinity enters into union with his essentially human personality.¹

Theodotus of Byzantium and Artemon stand at the head of this school. They considered Jesus to be an ordinary man, but supposed that he was begotten supernaturally, and that the Holy Spirit further descended specially upon him at the baptism. They were thus in exact accordance with the doctrine of the first three Gospels concerning Christ; and they also maintained firmly the points which distinguish this doctrine from the Johannine Logos-theology. But what makes their appearance in the Roman Church especially remarkable is, that it marks the crisis which now took place in Christological thought. The Artemonites (according to the account which Eusebius² takes from a work of one of their opponents), asserted that till the time of the Roman bishop Victor, the doctrine which they taught had been received in the Church of Rome as delivered by the apostles, and that it first suffered corruption under Victor's successor, Zephyrinus. The doctrine since prevalent, that Christ's nature was divine in itself, had, according to them, but recently arisen. We need only cast our eyes back on the stages through which the dogma of the person of Christ had passed up to this time, and realise what the point was, which was now chiefly in question, and we shall soon be convinced that the common opinion, which regards this as a groundless allegation, is mistaken. That Christ's person was divine in itself was not a firmly established view, so long as the conception of the Logos

¹ Cp. Euseb. Ec. Hist. v. 28, where it is said of the Artemonites, they are τὸν ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενον ἀγνοοῦντες; and, vii. 30, of Paul of Samosata, λέγει 'Ιησοῦν Χριστὸν κάτωθεν.

² Ec. Hist. v. 28.

was not yet assigned to Christ's person as a standing predicate. If we bear this in mind, we must ask, Were not the Artemonites right when they said that the doctrine of the Logos had only lately arisen? A new proof of the unfixed, uncertain condition of Christology in the first decades of the third century is afforded by the work that we have so often mentioned, the *Philosophoumena*. The author, as we may gather from his own statements, took a very lively part in these controversies, and the doctrine of a personal Logos, which he supported, was still met by the charge of placing a second God by the side of the one God.¹ And even admitting that Victor expelled Theodotus from the communion of the Church on account of his doctrine, still the doctrine of the Logos was so far from universal acceptance, that not only Callistus, the most important member of those Monarchians, afterwards became Bishop of Rome, but his predecessor Zephyrinus, Victor's successor, also shared the same views. Nevertheless, it is the time of Zephyrinus which makes an epoch in this subject. For nothing else than the energy with which, even under Zephyrinus, opponents of Monarchianism, as the author of the *Philosophoumena*, insisted on the claims of the opposite doctrine, can have been the cause that procured it from that time an ever more and more decisive ascendancy.²

¹ Cp. *Philos.* ix. 11 *sq.*, p. 284. They are called *δίθεοι* by their opponents, the author says. Οὐ γὰρ, says Callistus against them, p. 289, ἐπὶ δύο θεοὺς, πατέρα καὶ υἱόν, ἀλλ' ἓνα. On the author's doctrine of the Logos, cp. *Philos.* x. 33, p. 334 *sq.*

² The subject of the preceding paragraphs requires a more minute discussion. The trustworthiness of the author of the *Philos.* has been much contested in the Catholic interest. Whether the author of the *Refutation of Heresies* was the Roman presbyter Caius, as I have maintained in special opposition to Bunsen, or, as is now commonly supposed, the Bishop Hippolytus; in any case he was a very eminent party-leader, belonging to the Roman Church, and a writer whose account, if it may be taken as true, gives us a very clear idea of the position of dogma in the Roman Church at the beginning of the third century. Döllinger having maintained (*Hippolytus und Kallistus, oder die römische Kirche in der ersten Hälfte des dritten Jahrhunderts*, Regensb. 1853, p. 232 *sq.*) that Hippolytus in his *Philosophoumena* has admitted unmistakable contradictions and inaccuracies into his statement of the doctrine of Callistus, I have tried to show (*Theol. Jahrb.* 1854, *Cajus und Hippolytus*, p. 358 *sq.*) that this is

Beryllus, the bishop of Bostra, in Arabia, must be reckoned not among the first, but the second class of Monarchians. This point has now been placed beyond doubt by thorough discussion. He denied the personal pre-existence of Christ (*κατ' ἰδίαν οὐσίας περιγραφὴν*), and the essential divinity of his nature; his great

not the case, but that Döllinger himself gives an incorrect explanation of the passages in question. Against this D. Kuhn (*Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1855, p. 343 sq.; *die theologischen Streitigkeiten in der römischen Kirche und die Lehre derselben in der ersten Hälfte des dritten Jahrhunderts*) has warmly defended Döllinger's position, and emphatically returned on me the charge of erroneous interpretation. Since Callistus was the bishop of Rome, it certainly would, thinks Kuhn, be interesting, if nothing else, to ascertain that he was a Sabellian, as I have described him. "But why make him, the Pope of Rome, a present of Theodotianism? For this is also to be ascribed to him, according to Hippolytus; and thus we find he is a double heretic! There is, we say, only this alternative: either he is both, or he is neither. The decision is not hard to find—did the passionate opponent of Callistus know and write pure truth, or is his statement one-sided, prejudiced, coloured by partiality?"

I reply, he knew and wrote the truth: Callistus is not only doubly, but triply a heretic,—not only a Sabellian and Theodotian, but also a Noetian; and it is only by taking all this into consideration that we can correctly understand the controversies of this time. The author of the *Philosophoumena* states most directly (cf. ix. 7, 10, pp. 279, 284) that Callistus was an adherent of the dogma which was promulgated by Noetus at Smyrna, and was introduced into Rome by Epigonus and Cleomenes during the bishopric of Zephyrinus. Such being his primary position, it was quite possible for him to be a Theodotian as well as a Sabellian with regard to the controversy upon the proper definition of the unity and distinction of the Father and the Son. The difference between the doctrine of Noetus and that of Theodotus is, that while Noetus simply laid down the unity of the Father and the Son, and did not attempt to determine its nature, merely saying, that what the one is visibly, the other is invisibly,—Theodotus effected the unity of the two by means of the conception of the Spirit. According to the author of the *Philosophoumena* (vii. 35, p. 258), Theodotus taught that at the baptism in Jordan, Christ descended on the man Jesus in the form of a dove, and that no divine element worked in him before *ἢ ὥστε κατελθὺν ἀνεδείχθη ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα, ὃ εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν προσαγορεύει*. The conception of the Spirit was adopted by Callistus into his scheme, in order to add it to the doctrine of Noetus, and apply it to determine the relation of the Father and the Son; the two were one, as the *πνεῦμα ἀδιάκριτον καὶ τὰ πάντα γέμειν τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, τὰ τε ἄνω καὶ κάτω* (in analogy to the statement of Heraclitus, that all is full of souls and demons: cp. Lassalle, i. p. 275), *καὶ εἶναι τὸ ἐν τῇ παρθενῷ σαρκωθὲν πνεῦμα οἷον ἕτερον παρὰ τὸν πατέρα*, etc. In strict language, no doubt, it should be said that this view is known to us under the name of Praxeas; still, inasmuch as its principal conception is the *πνεῦμα*, an opponent might also style it the doctrine of Theodotus. When it is said that Callistus was not only

object was at once to maintain that his personality was essentially human, and to determine the proper mode of conceiving the divinity which, while it is ascribed to Christ, reposes on his humanity as its basis. Though he did not admit Christ's pre-human existence, he asserted that he had been predetermined

a Noetian and Theodotian, but also a Sabellian (Philos. ix. 12, p. 290), we have, doubtless, to explain this by the peculiar meaning which Sabellius gave to the Logos-idea. We must observe the position assigned by the Philosophoumena to Sabellius, whose historical significance becomes intimately known to us for the first time from this source. Callistus, we are told, p. 285, at one time spoke in the sense of the true doctrine, at another in a Sabellian sense; he further expelled Sabellius as one who might have led him into the right path. For Sabellius was not disinclined to receive the admonitions of the author of the Philosophoumena; but when he was alone with Callistus, he allowed himself to be drawn back by him into the dogma of Cleomenes. The author laid the greatest weight on the doctrine of a personally subsisting Logos, who is himself God (x. 33, p. 336). Sabellius agreed with him so far, in accepting the Logos-idea, but as a Monarchian he received it in a different sense. It may thus be said that Sabellius held a middle position between the two opposites; and Callistus, taking πνεῦμα and λόγος as identical, so far accorded with him. Πνεῦμα γὰρ, φησὶν (thus the heresy of Callistus is described, Philos. x. 27, p. 330), ὁ Θεὸς οὐχ ἑτερόν ἐστι παρὰ τὸν λόγον ἢ ὁ λόγος παρὰ τὸν Θεόν, ἐν αὐτῷ τούτῳ πρόσωπον, ὀνόματι μὲν μεριζόμενον, οὐσίᾳ δὲ οὐ. Cf. 289, where likewise it is stated that Callistus says, τὸν λόγον αὐτὸν εἶναι υἱόν, αὐτὸν καὶ πατέρα, ὀνόματι μὲν καλούμενον, ἐν δὲ ὄν, τὸ πνεῦμα ἀδιαίρετον. Here, the author expressly observes, Callistus set up this heresy because he openly reproached them, the author's party, with being δίδεοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σαβελλίου συχνῶς κατηγορεῖσθαι ὡς παραβάντος τὴν πρώτην πίστιν. Because, then, he was blamed by Sabellius, who had advanced beyond his first faith, he set up his heresy. The πρώτη πίστις can only be the doctrine of Noetus, in which Callistus and Sabellius agreed; and the παραβαίνειν of Sabellius from his first opinion, his progressive elaboration of his doctrine as to the Logos; and accordingly Callistus, when he wished to defend himself against the reproof of the other, could only say, τὸν λόγον αὐτὸν εἶναι υἱόν, etc. And yet it is asserted that he again broke with Sabellius, and even expelled him from Rome! This is the point on which Kuhn lays especial stress in his argument against me. Words (he says) are always much more easily misrepresented and distorted than actions. The fact (he proceeds) that Callistus took a middle position between Hippolytus and Sabellius is plainly apparent as the true kernel of the whole of Hippolytus's diatribe against him; this fact, equally indisputable and instructive, must not be overlooked; indeed, it is seen as the firmest point of certainty, and as the guiding clew in the midst of the labyrinth of the statements of Hippolytus. Therefore, among the other things in my dissertation that Kuhn does not understand, he cannot comprehend my styling Callistus a Sabellian, while I not only neglect to assign its true importance to the excommunication of

in the mind of God, and therefore had at least an ideal pre-existence. The divinity that was superadded to his human personality, he described by a term which certainly does not

Sabellius by this same Callistus, but even omit to mention the fact altogether (p. 347). Now the expulsion of Sabellius is a fact, but the alleged middle position of Callistus is a mere presupposition. On the other hand, the motives which led Callistus to this action stand out so clearly in the statement of the *Philosophoumena*, that no further explanation is needed. If Callistus, before he was bishop, because it was his interest to procure the support of Sabellius, accommodated himself to the doctrine of the latter, what more natural than that, after he had reached his aim, he should discard Sabellius, and even expel him in order to create a favourable impression with the opposite party? *Philos. ix. 12, p. 288: νομίζων δὲ τετυχηκέναι οὗ ἔθρηπτο, τὸν Σαβέλλιον ἀπέωσεν ὡς μὴ φρονούντα ὁρθῶς, etc.* All this shows plainly enough how doubtful and unfixed the doctrine of the Trinity still was at this time in the Roman Church, and how thoroughly therefore the above-mentioned assertion of the heretics, that, till the time of Bishop Zephyrinus, Monarchianism was the received and prevalent doctrine at Rome, is confirmed by the whole delineation of the circumstances of the Roman Church contained in the *Philosophoumena*. In my *Geschichte der Trinitätslehre*, i. p. 279, I had already maintained the truth, in all essential points, of this assertion of the Monarchians; and D. Gieseler (in a dissertation on Hippolytus, *die ersten Monarchianer und die römische Kirche in der ersten Hälfte des dritten Jahrh., Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1853, p. 767 sq.*), has now adopted the same view. Whatever forms Monarchianism assumed, its chief antithesis was always (though Kuhn in his dissertation, where he presupposes that the doctrine of Callistus was purely orthodox and Nicene, pays no regard to this fact) that form of the doctrine of the Logos which found its most resolute champion in the author of the *Philosophoumena*. Thus, in a history of the doctrine of the Trinity, we must assign to this writer as important a position in the Church of Rome as to Tertullian in that of Africa: and, in fact, the assertion of the heretics coincides with that which we find in Tertullian's polemic against the Monarchian Praxeas (c. 3):—*Simplices quique, ne dixerim imprudentes et idiotae, quae major semper credentium pars est, quoniam et ipsa regula fidei a pluribus diis seculi ad unicum et verum deum transfert, non intelligentes, unicum quidem, sed cum sua οἰκονομία esse credendum, expavescunt ad οἰκονομίαν. Numerum et dispositionem trinitatis divisionem praesumunt unitatis, quando unitas ex semet ipsa derivans trinitatem non destruat ab illa sed administretur. Itaque duos et tres jam jactitant a nobis praedicari; se vero unius dei cultores praesumunt, quasi non et unitas irrationaliter collecta haeresim faciat, et trinitas rationaliter expensa veritatem constituat.* Here the circumstances of the dispute are exactly the same as in the *Philosophoumena*. The great majority of believers merely insist on the opposition to heathen polytheism, and accordingly refuse to listen to the doctrine of the Logos. This doctrine has yet to make its way; but its adherents apprehend that it expresses the deeper and more concrete significance of Christianity: hence its connection with Montanism, and the greater moral earnestness which distinguishes the author of the *Philosophoumena* from Callistus.

point to the idea of emanation, but can only be understood of a free spiritual agency of God, resting on moral unity.¹

It should be observed what prominence the doctrine of Beryllus gives to the conception of personality, the being *κατ' ἰδίαν οὐσίας περιγραφὴν*; personal being, a being circumscribed, limited, and marked off in its own separate independence. This points to the great significance of this conception for determining the relation of the divine and human elements in the person of Christ: and here is the point of transition from Beryllus to Paul of Samosata. These two Monarchians stand in the same relation to one another as Noetus and Sabellius. The Christology of Paul correlates exactly with that of Sabellius. The two Christologies represent alike characteristically the standpoint of the two Monarchian schools: and as the views of Sabellius, with reference to their general character, can only be termed pantheistic, so those of Paul must be called theistic, if we use these words as they are applied when we say generally that the pantheistic and the theistic theories are essentially opposed. From the point of view of Sabellius, the human element in its union with the divine is but the manifestation of the latter. The tendency of Paul's doctrine, on the other hand, is to keep the human and the divine as separate as possible, and to present God and the man Jesus as two equally personal self-subsisting subjects confronting one another. Like Theodotus and Artemon, Paul started from the assumption that Christ, though supernaturally begotten, is in himself a mere man: but he carried on the development of this theory to a further stage, in that he was the first to speak of a Christ who had become God (*τεθεοποιῆσθαι*). If Christ is not God by his own nature, then he was not, but became, that which he is as a divine being: and how did he become such? The material means by which, according to Theodotus, the divine was imparted to Jesus—viz., the descent of the Holy Spirit at his baptism,—could not satisfy Paul. In the moral element alone could the divine and human in Christ be bound together in unity.

¹ The term *ἐμπολιτεύεσθαι*, taken from political and social life, is used of the existence of the Father in the Son. Euseb. E. H. vi. 33.

By the way of moral endeavour and progress towards moral perfection alone did Christ, while being a man, as in himself he is, become God and a Son of God. But again, this moral element, if it is to be regarded as the means of raising the human to the divine, cannot be conceived as purely human and separate from all divine co-operation. Here then is the point at which Paul availed himself of the idea of the Logos—now not to be omitted in any system of doctrine. But in order to prevent any admission of a personal Logos, he would not apply the conception to Christ without defining the proper nature of the Logos as existing in God. The Logos in God is that which he is also in man, the inward spiritual principle of thought and self-consciousness. God is, in his Logos, God personal and self-conscious; as the Logos is in man the inward man or the principle of his personality. It is only then in inseparable unity with God that the Logos is what he is: and he can no more have a personal existence external to God than he can sunder himself from this unity. Holding then that the Logos wrought and dwelt in the man Jesus, Paul nevertheless admitted here no unity of God and man in substance, but merely a divine agency, enhancing the human powers of the will and understanding. There can be no question here of a unity of God and man. On the contrary, we have before us two personally distinct subjects: the whole mode of thought is dualistic, and its chief aim is to keep the divine and human elements apart in their essential distinction.

The warm feeling which Paul's doctrine aroused against him, and which did not rest till the sentence of condemnation had been pronounced on the doctrine, and the author thrust out of his see at Antioch,—the malignant reproaches which were cast on his character, connecting his insistence on the human element in Christ's person with vile and worldly inclinations,—the whole Church opposition that rose against him,—all this amply shows how thoroughly Christians were now accustomed to regard the dogma of Christ's pre-human personality as a part of orthodoxy. The last of the synods that were held in reference to this matter,

that of Antioch in the year 269, was in many respects a prelude of the Nicene Council. It is remarkable, however, that the same word which was afterwards used to sum up Nicene orthodoxy, now fell under the condemnation of the fathers of Antioch. They expressly declared that the Son of God is not *ὁμοούσιος* with the Father. According to Athanasius,¹—who could not deem the fathers of Antioch less orthodox than those of Nice, and for this reason suffered not the contradiction to disturb his reliance on Church tradition,—the reason for this declaration was that it was the simplest method of rejecting the dialectical arguments of the Samosatene. Paul argued thus according to Athanasius:—if it was not granted that Christ was by nature a mere man, he must be of like substance with the Father: but if the Father and Son stood side by side as *ὁμοούσιοι*, then above them both another existing *οὐσία*, as the unity to which they are alike subordinated, must be presupposed. The doctrine of the Antiochian fathers, that Christ was by nature God, would thus lead to the assertion—inadmissible in itself—that the Father was not the highest and the absolute God.² This conclusion, leading directly to Sabellianism, could only be avoided (it was thought) by the denial of the Homoousia.

At this point of the development of the doctrine of the Godhead of Christ, there were still very various and sharply-contrasted

¹ De Syn. Arim. et Sel. c. 45.

² *Μία προηγουμένη οὐσία* with two other *οὐσῖαι*, its emanations (Athanas.). If we press the idea of Homoousia to such a degree as to make the Father and the Son two completely co-ordinate essences, there must stand above them both another *οὐσία*, whose emanations they both are. The clearest statement of this point is given by Athanasius, de Syn. c. 51, where he argues against those who say *μὴ χρῆναι λέγειν ὁμοούσιον τὸν υἱὸν τῷ πατρὶ, ὅτι ὁ λέγων ὁμοούσιον τρία λέγει, οὐσίαν τινὰ προποκειμένην, καὶ τοὺς ἐκ ταύτης γεννωμένους ὁμοουσίους εἶναι, καὶ ἐπιλέγουσιν, ἔαν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοούσιος ᾖ τῷ πατρὶ, ἀνάγκη προποκεῖσθαι αὐτῶν οὐσίαν, ἐξ ἧς καὶ ἐγεννήθησαν, καὶ μὴ εἶναι τὸν μὲν πατέρα, τὸν δὲ υἱόν, ἀλλ' ἀμφοτέρους ἀδελφούς.* The conception against which Paul directs his arguments is in essence the same as that of Sabellius. In Sabellius's system, the Father stood on a level with the Son and the Spirit, and above them all was placed the *μονὰς*, the *μία προηγουμένη οὐσία*, or the highest God. It is uncertain, however, whether Sabellius used the term *ὁμοούσιος* to characterise the co-ordinate relation of his three *πρόσωπα*.

ideas on the subject in men's minds. The most decided tendency of all was a rejection of the view which made the divine so much less conspicuous and essential than the human element of Christ's person, that Christ could only be regarded as essentially human. The opposite opinion, proceeding from the idea of God, though it granted that Christ was substantially divine, yet deemed him but a transitory manifestation, showing forth a particular phase of the one divine essence. But neither could this satisfy the Christian consciousness. The dignity of Christ seemed to require that he should have existed as a personal divine essence before his human appearance on earth. But this supposition too was met by difficulties not easily to be surmounted. Not only did it conflict with the idea of the unity of God: even were this disregarded in spite of the Monarchian resistance, yet doubt seemed to be cast on Christ's dignity by the very belief that was thought most indispensable. For when the Son of God, or the Logos, could only be conceived in his personal subsistence as a being who had proceeded forth from God in a definite movement, not only were temporal change and material affection imported into the being of God, according to the fashion of the Gnostic emanations, but the doubt inevitably arose, whether he who had thus originated, who stood so deeply below the one highest God, could be rightly considered as essentially divine. If we bring together in one view all the active tendencies thus resulting from the previous development of the doctrine in question, we shall place ourselves at the point at which Origen stood when he took up the task presented to theology, and led on theological speculation to a further stage.

In the doctrine of Origen we see a new and most important force contributing to shape the gradual growth of dogma. We may distinguish in it two essentially related sides. On the one side, Origen regarded it as a truth certain above all else, that the Son could only be a being personally distinct from the Father, and self-subsisting. But if he is not a mere power and property of God: if, therefore, he exists not in God, but without God: he must, as thus distinguished from God, bear a dependent and sub-

ordinate relation to him. Ascribing the highest importance to the absoluteness of the idea of God, Origen could not admit that over against the Father, as the absolute God, there stood another not less absolute being in the person of the Son. If, then, the full reality of the conception of the Son involves the conclusion that he is a special hypostasis, still his subordination to the Father is a not less essentially determining notion; and Origen, therefore, did not hesitate to describe the Son, by comparison with the Father, as a far inferior being in every respect. Thus he would affirm absolute goodness of the Father alone, not of the Son, and confine the agency of the Son to the reasonable or logical element, subordinating it to the universal agency of the Father. But the wider the gulf which this precisely determined distinction created between the Father and the Son, the more earnestly, on the other side, did Origen seek to fill up the chasm. However far the Son stands below the Father, however impossible it is from the nature of the case that he should equal the absolute essence of the Father, yet in one point he partakes of the same absoluteness. For, although begotten, yet it is not in time, at a definite moment before the creation of the world, that he was begotten. He was begotten from eternity: his existence, in respect of time, is as truly without a beginning, as absolutely eternal, as that of the Father. This is the principal conception round which Origen's whole doctrine of the relation of the Father and the Son revolves. By means of the idea of the Son's co-equal eternity with the Father, the Son was to be placed in a relation to the Father that should answer to the absolute essence of God; all emanationist ideas were to be kept apart from the notion of God, the subordination of the Son on the one side was to be counterbalanced on the other, finite and infinite were to be bound together in unity. The absolute essence of God was a sufficient ground for an eternal process of creation, and for the eternal generation of the Son. Since it is impossible to conceive a time before which God was not, but wherein he first became that which belongs to his absolute essence, he must have been from eternity both the creator of a

world and the Father of a Son. If he is the All-ruler, then that, in respect of which he is the All-ruler, must also always have existed. Again, there can have been no beginning of his Fatherhood; for it is not with him as with human fathers; no obstacle can be conceived that could keep back or delay his Fatherhood. For if God is always perfect, and always has the power to be a Father, and it is good that he should be the Father of such a Son, what could prevent him from actually being such? If the eternity of the Son is thus based on the absolute perfection of the divine essence, everything which, according to common modes of thought, gives the generation of the Son too close an analogy to a mere natural process, at once disappears. Origen could only conceive it as an extra-temporal divine act not to be brought under any category of human thought; since it was utterly inconsistent with the idea of God to suppose that an element, changeable in time and corporeally divisible, was included in his essence.

But though Origen thus sought to strip the idea of generation of all positive determinations, and to grasp it in the highest possible abstraction, still for all his pains there pressed on him a question destined afterwards to divide the different views of the relation of the Father and the Son by a very sharply-defined contrast. Was the Son begotten from the substance of the Father, or evoked and brought forth by an act of God's will? Origen did not throw the question into a determinate form; but it is clearly the cause of his continual oscillation between these two statements. True, he ascribes to the Son a community of substance with the Father, uses the term *ὁμοούσιος*, even says that the Son is begotten out of the Father's substance, and compares him to an efflux, a radiation of light. But again, in the same connection, he speaks not of the substance, but of the will of the Father; and though he here speaks only analogically, and only admits that the Son is begotten by the Father as the will is sent forth from the spirit, without sundering it, or being sundered from it, still he says directly, in reference to the Son, that the Father's will suffices to call forth whatsoever he will; that the hypostasis of the Son is

begotten by the mere means of his will.¹ Thus we see him expressly declaring that the will of the Father is the principle of the Son's subsistence; and if we further consider all his teaching with respect to the distinction of the Son from the Father,—his difference of being, his subordination, the great inferiority of his dignity and agency,—we can hardly disagree with those who regarded him as a chief authority for Arian doctrine, and even called him the father of Arianism. Nevertheless, all his disparagement of the Son in respect of his subordination to the Father, was in turn compensated by the exalted attribute of eternity; an attribute which no doctor before him had assigned to the Son with such a full sense of its speculative significance.

Thus considered, Origen marks a momentous turning-point in the history of dogma. The two tendencies which, from the commencement of Christian dogma, proceeded side by side in parallel courses, both alike authorised by the Christian consciousness—the one seeking to place the Son on an equality with the Father, and to identify them in unity of essence; the other to distinguish the two, and to bring the one into definite subordination to the other—are here united, and each invested with the same importance. But instead of again running parallel, from this point they diverge more and more, until their separation has been carried to its utmost width, and an adjustment became necessary. After Origen's time, the development of dogma advanced rapidly to this consummation.

Of the two sides of Origen's system, that which laid especial stress on the distinction and separation of the Son from the Father was adopted, in a more or less decided form, by his disciples and successors. Among these, Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, holds especial prominence, as representing a doctrine very generally received. The fragmentary statements of the ancient writers do

¹ Confirmatory passages are cited in my *Trinitäts-Lehre*, i. 196 *sq.*, and in *Redepenning's Origenes*, ii. 293 *sq.* When Redepenning finds fault with me (p. 302) for speaking of Origen as wavering with respect to the generation of the Son, he seems to me to have given insufficient consideration to the expressions of Origen which he himself quotes.

not permit a closer determination of their views. But as they repeated the established comparisons afforded by the idea of emanation, termed the Son a creature, and were regarded with much repugnance by the later orthodox doctors, it is very probable that they did not maintain the principal point of the doctrine of Origen, the eternity of the Son. Dionysius of Alexandria is said to have expressly denied the eternity of the Son, and to have come so near to Arianism as already to use the formula *ἦν ποτε, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*, and to put forward a subordination-theory. The most offensive expressions of his theory, however, he afterwards thought fit to soften: several Sabellianistically-affected Libyan bishops having brought a complaint against their Alexandrian bishop to the Roman bishop Dionysius, the latter, in answer to this complaint, sent forth a synodal epistle, directed both against Sabellianism and Tritheism. In this document he affirmed a divine Triad, consistent and closely combined, however, with the monarchy of God. Though he thus approached very near to the Nicene doctrine, he yet left the opposing ideas simply stated, without any link of connection between them.¹ This state of uncertainty, in which the two ideas acted and reacted on one another, and neither could permanently gain a firmer position than the other, was only terminated by the Arian controversy.

The characteristic quality of Arianism, by reason of which it marks an epoch, is, that in it the disagreement of the two conflicting modes of view—still so different, and coming into such constant and varied contact with each other, is expressed for the first time with regard to one solid and tangible point of debate;

¹ It is merely in appearance, as D. Kuhn (p. 336 *sq.*) has correctly shown, that Dionysius, in the fragment in Athanasius de decr. Syn. Nic. c. 26, speaks of three distinct views, the Sabellian, the Tritheistic, and that of Dionysius of Alexandria. There are, in fact, only two against which Dionysius declares himself. The Tritheistic view is the same as that of Dionysius of Alexandria, who is charged both with separating the unity of God into three Godheads, and with saying that the Son is a creature, and was not from the first, but came into being. Cp. Athanas. de sent. Dion. c. 13: here also it is only said that Dionysius of Rome wrote against two opinions, the Sabellian and that which resembled Arianism.

in it, for the first time, they are referred to an antithesis which is clearly and definitely proclaimed, and steadily adhered to. If the Son in his prehuman existence could not be conceived as a being personally distinct from the Father (as it was required to conceive him) without being regarded as a being far inferior to the Father, dependent on and subordinate to him, then it became needful to determine precisely upon what cardinal point the whole distinction between these two beings ultimately turned. Supposing that the Son, although originated, was yet begotten from the substance of the Father, and in substance the same as the Father, how could he nevertheless be placed so far below him? Whatever determinations of the relation of the Father and the Son might be offered remained vague and uncertain, so long as it was not first attempted to answer the inquiry—What was the absolute principle of their distinction? According to the ancient doctors, Arianism had a marked tendency to dialectic, and from the standpoint of the Church of course it was impossible not to blame the Arians for trying to base their theory chiefly on dialectic, and therefore addressing themselves so earnestly and exclusively to the dialectical method. But this charge points to those characteristic qualities of Arianism, without which it could never have gained such historical significance,—its methodical procedure, its adherence to definiteness of conception, and boldness in accepting legitimate conclusions.

Arianism then from the first, in the person of its founder, the Alexandrian presbyter Arius, felt itself forced to undertake the problem of a searching inquiry into the true nature of the relation of the Father and the Son, and the principle of the distinction between them. But what final solution of the question could be reached if the Son had already received the attribute of eternity, so that even the conception of generation was no obstacle to his being deemed, in the infinite duration of his existence, a not less absolute being than the Father? Still, however completely the Son was made equal with the Father, however thoroughly all points of distinction were cast away, there remained one attribute

which, since the Son could in no wise share it with the Father, separated him absolutely from the Father: the Father was not begotten. Starting from this point, Arianism worked out its tenets in strict logical consistency. The Father alone is unbegotten; herein consists his absolute essence. The Son, since he is not unbegotten like the Father, but, as being the Son, is begotten, cannot be of like substance with the Father, but must be in substance different. He is therefore not begotten from the essence of the Father; he is, in fact, not begotten at all; he is made. Further, since, if he is not begotten from the substance of the Father, there is nothing out of which he could be made, it can only be said that he is made out of nothing. If he were of the substance of the Father, and therefore in substance the same as the Father, then there would be two alike unbegotten, or equally absolute beings; but this is a contradiction. Again, if the Son is made out of nothing, and if accordingly it may be said of him that he originated, then his being had a beginning; and though his transition from not-being to being be conceived as abstractly as possible, it can only be said that once he was not. If the Son had not originated; if, on the contrary, he were eternal, then he would be of the same eternity with the Father; but the Father is eternal only because he is unbegotten. When these two propositions, each equally characteristic of Arianism—the Son is *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*, and *ἦν ποτε, ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*—have been laid down, the Son is separated from the Father by so vast a gulf, that he can belong to no other class than that of creatures. But yet he stands above them, and for this reason: though a creature himself, he is yet the creator of creatures; though he has originated, yet he did not originate in time, but before time; time itself came into being through him. On the other hand, though Arius, having regard to such considerations, called him God, God in the full sense of the word, the absolute distinction between him and the Father could by no means be thereby effaced. Thus the general aspect under which Arius regarded the relation of the Father and the Son was the antithesis of finite and infinite. As

the finite and the infinite are simply contrary, so between the Father and the Son there can be no mediating link of connection; and therefore Arius repudiated most decidedly all physical analogies and emanational ideas. If the Father and the Son have nothing in common as regards their substance, the principle of the Son's existence cannot be sought in the substance, but only in the will of the Father. He is through the mere will of the Father, as all else that is without God has been made by the act of his will.

The opponents of Arianism could at first raise no effective objection against this chain of argument. They only insisted that if there is the same distinction, the same antithesis between the Father and the Son as between finite and infinite, then the Son must resign whatever divine attributes Arius, out of a wish to raise him above other things that are made, still permitted him to retain. They justly asked whether it were not a contradiction that the Son, himself merely a creature, should be also the creator of creatures; and though he had himself originated, and was conditioned in respect of his commencement by the category of time, should, as the creator of time, stand above all time. The consequences of Arianism went still further: the antithesis of finite and infinite must be still more strictly followed out, and the final result would be, that the Son, as a simply finite being, could lay no claim whatever to be considered divine.

But such objections availed nothing, so long as the system which denied the divinity of the Son was not opposed by another resting on positive foundations. If this was to be done, some point must be discovered in the Arian reasoning which would render a logical resistance to the conclusions possible. Now the Arians, arguing from the conception of God as an unbegotten being, assumed that to be unbegotten was to be eternal; that the two conceptions were in fact identical. This their opponents could not admit without being also prepared to surrender all that constituted the intimate connection of the Son with the substance of the Father. If then he was not to be degraded by the logic of

the Arian arguments to simple finiteness, eternity of being must above all be ascribed to him. But since, as the Son, he can only be begotten, not unbegotten, this could not be done unless some medium were discovered between finite and infinite, which should be both at once naturally infinite and naturally finite. The want was satisfied by the conception of the eternal generation of the Son, as affirmed by the anti-Arians. The Son, as begotten, derives his existence from another, and therefore, like all that does not contain the cause of its being in itself, must belong to the category of the finite. But inasmuch as he is begotten from eternity, the finiteness, the dependence, the conditioned nature of his substance disappear (it is supposed) in the eternity of his being.

While then Arianism defines the relation of the Father and the Son by the abstract antithesis of two mutual exclusives, finite and infinite, according to the opposite doctrine it is precisely the unity of finite and infinite in the Son that forms the characteristic idea of his personality. But here the question arises, whether this unity, which as the unity of finite and infinite is purely abstract, is such that it can be figured to the mind, and corresponds to concrete reality. Though the relation of the Father and Son, as determined by the conception of eternal generation, was so peculiar that the ordinary categories of human thought were inapplicable to it, still, it was urged, it ought to be capable of being placed before the imagination in some comprehensible and tangible form. But here was the weak point of the theory. All that the anti-Arian doctors could bring forward to justify themselves was the well-known analogy, already often used, of the natural relation between the light and the ray. The Father cannot be conceived apart from the Son whom he has begotten, any more than the ray can be separated from the light. But if the relation of the Son to the Father is that of a ray proceeding from light, what becomes of the personal subsistence of the Son, an idea no less essential to the true conception of him? Is the Son a mere accident of the substance of the Father, a mere unessential reflection? If it was replied that the distinction

between the natural phenomena and the analogous relation of the Father and the Son lay in this very point, that the Son in his unity with the Father possessed also his own personal existence, then the basis of the reasoning, the observation of a natural process, was abandoned, and the whole idea was made to rest on nothing. Thus the dilemma remained,—either the divine eternal generation must be conceived according to the analogy of a natural process, and the supramaterial substance of God be thereby apparently degraded to the material, so that the notion in question still remained open to the same objections as before, or all must be resigned, save a mere transcendental conception, devoid of all concrete significance.

A general view of the two opposite systems, as contrasted according to their respective governing principles, shows us plainly the same modes of view whose antagonism has appeared in its various phases in the whole previous history of dogma. We have now merely a new and more sharply-defined form of antithesis. But the fact that the antithesis was now so sharply marked gave promise of a final decision of the struggle. During the whole previous course of development, the prominent tendency of the Christian mind had been to hold fast equally to the two equally essential principles of the Son's unity with the Father and his personal distinction from him, difficult as it was to combine the two in a real and not merely apparent consistency. So much had anti-Arianism in its favour. But when Arianism put forth such energy, and applied its analysing dialectic to such unsparing rejection of all but clear and definite conceptions, whatever difficulty the anti-Arians already felt in maintaining their own doctrine, so deficient in precision and intrinsic vigour, was inevitably increased. The circumstances, however, which had lately procured for Christianity quite a new position in the world, interfered to exert a powerful influence on the decision of the controversy. Already the political situation of the Christians, now that the persecutions had ceased, and Christianity was on the point of becoming the Roman state-religion, had essentially

contributed to give the Arian controversy a far greater extent and importance than that of any previous dispute. And now, under an emperor who united in himself the Christian and the Roman powers, the decision was closely bound up with Roman state interests. In the Empire generally, Constantine, as sole ruler, made it his systematic policy to bring harmony out of discordance, to reconcile conflicting and to adjust incongruous elements, and to found a new order of things, in which Christianity was to take the position that rightly belonged to it. In the same spirit he applied himself to the Arian question, in order, with regard to this also, to establish over the whole world rest, order, and peace. He summoned the Council of Nice, the first œcumenical council, representing the whole Christian part of the Roman world, a meeting which marks an epoch chiefly because it was an imposing manifestation of the unity of Christianity with the Roman state, and of the attachment both of the state and the Christian Church to this unity. The resolutions adopted at such a council must necessarily be of the highest importance. The result of the Council of Nice was that Arianism was rejected, and that the belief in the Son was enunciated in the formula: He is begotten from the substance of God, God begotten from God, light from light, very God from very God, begotten, not made, of the same substance (*ὁμοούσιος*) with the Father.

The Homoousia was ever afterwards the standing characteristic expression for the relation of the Son to the Father, as finally determined and settled by the Church. One side of the doctrine of Christ's Godhead, namely, that side which had always tended to the closest identification of the Son and the Father, reached its furthest point of development in the Nicene conception. No further advance in this direction was possible, if there was to be any distinction at all between the Father and the Son. The Homoousia was intended to express the most decided antithesis to the Arian separation of the Father from the Son. If we seek for a more particular elucidation of the term, we may refer to such an authentic interpreter of the Council's meaning as Athanasius—

himself one of the chief spokesmen of the anti-Arian party. His elucidation, however, only serves to show that the conceptions of the orthodox disputants were far from having grasped any clear and determinate notion. We must by no means, says Athanasius, think of anything corporeal; abstracting from all materiality, we must view in pure thought the proper relation of the Son to the Father, of the Logos to God, and the perfect likeness of the ray to the light. Since the substance in question here is strictly incorporeal, the oneness of nature and of the identity of the light must be kept undivided. It is absolutely necessary to adhere to the metaphor of the light and the ray. The ray of the sun is nothing alien from him, nothing unlike him; light and ray are one and the same: the one is ever beheld in the other. In the same way, in the relation of the Father and the Son, the like oneness and natural property can be properly denoted by no other term than *ὁμοούσιος*. Such, accordingly, was the idea which the fathers of the Nicene Council designed to express by their formula.¹ The formula was therefore not intended to convey its apparently obvious meaning, the natural relation of two substances connected by derivation or emanation. And yet, on the other hand, this very physical analogy was to be the necessary figure by means of which alone this peculiar relation could be represented. The emphatic protest of Arius and his adherents against any joining of emanation with the idea of God, had at any rate had so much effect, that it was thought more necessary to be guarded on this side than on any other. For this reason the proposed formula, which gave rise to a lively dispute at the Council, could only be carried under the express proviso that it was not designed to enunciate concerning the Son any bodily affection, any separation, any division from the Father, since the immaterial, spiritual, incorporeal nature of God excluded all bodily affections. It was only to be taken as expressing this—that the Son bore no likeness to the creatures, but was in every way like the Father who had begotten him, and like him alone. But how was it to be

¹ Athanas. de Decr. Syn. Nic. c. 20-25.

said that he was begotten from the Father, if nothing could be said concerning the manner of his generation? Although, therefore, the formula seemed to be perfectly positive, nothing was really established but an indeterminate, negative conception, devoid of concrete meaning; and all the efforts exerted to secure the adoption of the formula would have been in vain, had not the authority of the Emperor interposed. It is true that the doctors (*e.g.* Athanasius) attempt to ignore the operation of this cause. But the narrative of Eusebius removes all doubt that the personal influence of the Emperor decided the final result of the Council. The fact that the Emperor had at first declared a different opinion¹ confirms the supposition that it was Alexandrian influence which induced him to favour the term *ὁμοούσιος*. For such was the power which the hierarchy had now attained, that the ultimate guiding force in this matter, as in others, can be looked for nowhere else. Now, if we recall the first commencement of this struggle, we shall observe that, in Alexandria, where the presbyters longest maintained their free position against the bishops, a presbyter stood at variance with his bishop upon the doctrine of the Godhead of Christ; and that hence the controversy arose. It was inevitable that the final decision should be such as to give the bishop the victory over the presbyter who opposed him. The further history of dogma shows plainly enough how close was the connection between the dogma now established as Catholic and the hierarchical aims and requirements of the bishops.

We have thus seen that the doctrine of the Godhead of Christ is nothing else than the cardinal point of the whole theological movement of the pre-Nicene period. This doctrine may therefore be justly called the characteristic expression of the mind of the age, in so far as it was concerned with dogma. The overwhelming importance attributed to it, and its ultimate elaboration in the form of the Homoousia, would have been impossible, had not the universal tendency of men's minds been towards the supramaterial,

¹ Cf. the letter of Constantine to Alexander and Arius (Eusebius, *Vita Const.* ii. 69).

the metaphysical, the transcendental. Even in the case of the person of Christ, humanity was so overshadowed by divinity, that all ideas relating to the human element were really absent from dogmatic thought. But though all thought was thus absorbed in the idea of God, and turned upon pure theology, it did but dissipate itself in abstract definitions devoid of concrete meaning. Notwithstanding all endeavours to fix the relations of the Trinity, and thus to bring the idea of God to a precise dogmatic conception, the doctrine of God was not felt and appreciated as a truth that exerted a decisive influence upon the remaining articles of the faith. In fact, this first period generally is characterised by the peculiar relative position of the several elements which together form the furniture of the Christian religious mind. They stand apart and unconnected. Thus, when Origen in his work *Περὶ ἀρχῶν*, made the first attempt at a systematic statement of the Christian faith, he brought its essential principles under the three chief categories of God, the world, and freedom, and gave each of these three principles such an independent position by the side of the others, that each of the three parts was merely the whole under a different aspect.

Nor must this be thought a feature peculiar to Origen. Rather, it is thoroughly consistent with the standpoint then occupied by dogma in general. God—the world, as finite—man, as reasonable,—still confront one another in such complete independence, that (as we saw in Origen's system) the whole relation of man to God, or of God and the world, conceived by means of the idea of God on the one side and that of freedom on the other, is really viewed under a purely dualistic aspect. All that according to the later Church system composes specific Christian doctrine—the theory of the God-man, and of the means necessary for the salvation of man—is as yet virtually without a place in dogma. On the one hand, the true conception of grace and its effects in the later Church sense is foreign to the doctors of this period: they speak only of God's love and benignity, and his goodwill to man, or of his providence and government generally. With respect to man,

on the other hand, the greatest importance is attributed to the freedom of his will. Every eminent doctor expressly recognises the truth that unless man is free and, as free and self-determining, is the true accountable author of all his actions, the distinction disappears between good and evil, between virtue and vice, and there is no ground for ascribing to Christianity the character of a moral religion as distinguished from heathenism. Whatever gives man any moral and religious worth in the sight of God arises therefore out of freedom: and thus, from the nature of the case, the faith which is the condition of the attainment of Christian salvation can only be a practical behaviour, an active compliance with God's commands. This conception of freedom of itself repudiates that limitation of man's activity on the one side or the other which follows from the antithesis of sin and grace: and it especially refuses to suppose that the nature of man justifies the identification of sin and nature,—though no doubt Tertullian tended to this latter view. In order to maintain this idea of freedom in its fullest sense, not only was it firmly maintained in contrast and opposition to the rival heathen notion of blind fate and chance, and the Gnostic theory of astrological destiny, but endeavours were made to remove all the difficulties which it seemed to encounter in the doctrine of God's foreknowledge, or the belief in the prophecies, or texts apparently leaning to determinism. Nay, so unable were Christians now to conceive that the relation of man to God could rest on any other basis than human freedom, that Origen, the first doctor who put forth a theory of his own upon the relation of the divine and human elements in Christ's person, believed that freedom alone could here be the bond of the two natures in the God-man. According to the well-known Platonic tripartition, followed by Origen, the soul, as holding a middle position between the spirit and the body, is the principle of the will. The will decides itself with equal freedom in the direction of the spirit or of the body. Now all other souls being created by God as reasonable substances, have come down by apostasy from God from the upper world, and have thus, as cooled

spirits, become souls. That which is found in them now in a higher, now in a lower degree, and can only be affirmed of them relatively, may be affirmed of the soul of Jesus absolutely. His soul alone, through the undivided tendency of its will and the never-dying glow of its love, has been from the beginning so inseparably joined to the Divine Logos, that it has passed into its being. The two are no more two, but essentially one: and what was at first merely free determination of the will has become nature. Following this train of thought, Origen employed the image (afterwards so much used) of iron pervaded by the glow of fire, as a means of vividly presenting the penetration of the human by the divine in Christ's person. The same principle of moral freedom, as necessarily belonging to reasonable beings, which is thus so important for the doctrine of man and Christ, is extended also to the doctrine of angels and demons. From the freedom of the will and the possibility of using it both for good and bad—from this and this alone comes the existence of demons as well as angels in the upper region between God and man. And when these two antagonistic realms had been presupposed, the field of Christian revelation was regarded from a dualistic point of view; the death of Christ being viewed as a struggle against the devil, and the struggles of the Christian martyrs being imagined as ever-victorious repulses of the attacks of the demons after Christ's example.

The doctrine of angels and demons on the one side, and the doctrine of the last things on the other, enabled fancy to range freely over the domain of the supra-material, and gave a wide scope to the influence of heathen and Jewish ideas: and thus Christianity could never afterwards cease to be conscious of that element, belonging also to heathenism and Judaism, from which it had sprung. But on the other hand, a doctrine was at that time being formed, which not only, like the doctrine of the Trinity, expressed what was peculiar to Christian dogma, but also afforded a very specific expression of the character of Christianity, as it now began to assume the shape of the Church. This was the doctrine concerning

the Church itself. The basis of the dogma of the one saving Church was already laid; it was uttered by Cyprian when he laid down that he who had not the Church for his mother, could not have God for his father.¹ This tenet was in fact only the consequence of premises already given. It could not but necessarily follow, when the idea of the Catholic Church had gained such realisation that none could belong to its community who did not confess its tradition; and when still further, Catholic dogma acquired its proper and determinate substance in the doctrine of the divinity of Christ.

But even in the controversy against the Montanists and Novatians—the first occasion on which the doctrine of the Church was brought into discussion—it was inevitably seen that if the one Apostolic Church was to be not only Catholic, but also holy, the predicates thus attributed to it would become conflicting antinomies. According to the Montanist and Novatianist view of the essence of the Church, the predicate of holiness was so highly exalted, that the Church, as the Church of the Spirit, was only to consist of the spirituales in contra-distinction to the psychici. They therefore wished to exclude from the Church all whose transgressions were so notorious, that if they were included within it, it could not maintain this predicate of holiness.²

As therefore the Catholic Christians, the psychici, were obliged, in order not to compromise the catholicity of the Church, to curtail the notion of the Church's holiness and to make the criterion of

¹ Cyprian de Unitate Ecclesiae, c. 5: Habere jam non potest Deum patrem, qui ecclesiam non habet matrem. Si potuit evadere quisquam, qui extra arcam Noe fuit, et qui extra ecclesiam foris fuerit, evadet. The same doctrine appears in the Shepherd, where the Church is represented under the image of a tower in process of building, for which only the stones described by the Shepherd can be used.—Vis. 3. The writer entertains the exalted idea of the Church, that it omnium prima creata est, et propter illam mundus factus est.—Vis. 2. 4.

² In this sense the Novatians called themselves "the pure," καθαρὸς. It is in connection with them that the term "Catholic" first appears in its special significance. Eusebius says of the Roman presbyter Novatus (E. H. vi. 43), the same whose Roman name is generally Novatian, that he as the founder of the Novatians, ἰδίας αἰρεσέως τῶν κατὰ λογισμοῦ φησίωντων Καθαροῦς ἑαυτοὺς ἀποφηνάντων ἀρχηγὸς καθίσταται.

communion with her consist in mere assent to her doctrine and tradition, so the Montanists and Novatians were obliged to subordinate the notion of catholicity to that of holiness. What makes a man unworthy of the communion of the Church was, according to them, the committing of any of those particular sins which they regarded as mortal. But what is lost through sin can be recovered by the forgiveness of sins. Thus the question of the Church is bound up with the question of the possibility of forgiveness and the right to forgive sins. The Montanists allowed the possibility of forgiveness, nor did they positively deny the right of the Church to receive again into her communion, with a declaration of forgiveness, those who had fallen into mortal sin. They asserted however,¹ that absolution could in no case be given by the clergy, the bishops of the Catholic Church, but could only be given by the prophets, as the organs of the Spirit who stood upon the same level as the Apostles. Thus they regarded the forgiveness of sins not as the act of the Church, but as the immediate act of God. They therefore denied to the penitent sinner the absolution of the Church, but left open to him the hope of the mercy of God, exhorted him to penitence and repentance, and made him the object of their intercessions, while they left the result to the compassion of God. Thus, as has justly been observed,² a distinction was drawn between the relation of the individual to the Church and his relation to God, and the presumption was thus admitted that salvation could be obtained without the pale of the Church; and not only the exclusive character of the Church, but the very idea of the visible Church, was surrendered. It might not be perceived that this was the logical result of the position, but the principle of the Church was virtually given up. What was said was, in effect, that God alone can forgive sins; the prophets have indeed authority to do so, but they make no use of this authority, lest after the sins which are forgiven, other sins should be committed.³ They had thus before their eyes the

¹ See *supra*, p. 46.

² Schweglar, *Mont.* p. 232.

³ *Potest ecclesia donare delictum, sed non faciam, ne et alia delinquant*, says a Montanist prophet, quoted by Tertullian, *De Pud.* cap. 21.

apprehension, which the practice of the Catholic Church in subsequent times proved to be by no means unfounded, that the forgiveness of sins might itself prove a means of promoting sin. In order to guard against this danger, they desired that no forgiveness of sins should be granted at all; since what had happened once might equally well happen again at any future time. As penitence and repentance must always be conditions of the forgiveness of sins, the subject of repentance also opened up the same question. Indeed the question concerned the whole doctrine of the Church. Repentance being a necessary condition of the forgiveness of sins in baptism, the possibility of a second repentance after the first was a further and most important point in the conflict between the Catholic Church on the one side and the Montanists and Novatians on the other. One repentance after the first in baptism, as the limit of the divine indulgence, is conceded, not only by the Shepherd of Hermas,¹ but even by Tertullian² in his earlier period. After he became a Montanist, however, he declared repentance after baptism to be entirely vain and fruitless. Here we touch the turning-point of the strife between the Catholic Church and the Montanists, which we have already discussed. Cyprian taunted such opponents with the inconsistency of exhorting to repentance and yet refusing penance as a means of grace.³ On this point the Novatians agreed entirely with the Montanists, and even at the Synod of Nicaea the Novatian bishop Acesius appeared as a champion of Montanist principles regarding repentance and absolution.⁴

¹ Mand. iv. i. Cp. however, *supra*, p. 50 *sqq.*

³ Ep. lv.

² De Poenit. c. 7.

⁴ Socrates, E. H. i. 10.

PART FIFTH.

CHRISTIANITY AS A POWER RULING THE WORLD, IN ITS RELATION TO THE HEATHEN WORLD AND TO THE ROMAN STATE.

LOOKING at the various sides of the historical appearance of Christianity we see that it develops and realises on a constantly increasing scale the absolute idea which is its essential contents. It could not assert itself as a principle of salvation without doing away with the barrier of particularism which Judaism sought to place in its way: again, it could not take up its position in the world as a real historical phenomenon, without framing the idea of the Catholic Church which enabled it to throw off those tendencies which threatened it on two sides, and the prevalence of either of which would alike have made its historical development impossible. On the one side there was the danger of accepting the Christ of Gnosticism, in which case the specific faith of Christianity would have evaporated into the idea of a universal world-process, and Christianity itself would have melted into a general speculative view of the world. On the other side there was the danger of accepting a Montanist Christ, and of finding that Christianity had come into the world for no end but to lose in a short time, in that final catastrophe which put an end to all history, the basis of its own historical existence. Further, when Christianity proceeded to realise the contents of its own dogma, as the absolute truth immanent in the Catholic Church, it could not do so without advancing to the notion of the Homoousia, and thus, in the idea of a Christ who was essentially one with God, claiming

to be itself the highest absolute revelation of God. But even in all these advances Christianity had not yet exhausted the sphere in which it was to realise the absolute idea of its own nature. In all those relations which we have mentioned, the opposition which had to be surmounted was an inner one, and presented itself within the Christian circle. We have now to place before us the outer side of Christianity, that side which it turned to the non-Christian world. The very idea of the Catholic Church, being an idea which has to realise itself in order to reach its historical existence in the world, involves the notion of a power which outwardly as well as inwardly knows itself supreme and is able to overcome all opposition and hostility. If Christianity be the universal, the absolute religion, then it must attain to universal dominion and become the religion of the world. Christianity and the Roman Empire could not co-exist in the world without sooner or later coalescing in a unity. It is regarded as the most obvious proof of the divinity of Christianity that this goal was reached in so short a time and by so brilliant a victory. But what is much more important is to trace the path which led to this goal, considering what was its beginning at first, and following all its windings in such a way as to become aware not only of the change which appears so great in the history of the world, but also of the inner process by which it was brought about. If Christianity became the ruling religion of the Roman Empire, that must of necessity have been because its world-wide dominion was but the outward manifestation of the power which it had gained inwardly in the consciousness of the age. Thus in the historical subject with which we are now to deal, two distinct sides have to be considered. First of all the question presents itself in what way the change of the whole consciousness of the age came about in that heathen world which stood over against Christianity; and then we have to inquire how the outward position of Christianity relatively to the Roman Empire came more and more to correspond to that change which was going on inwardly in men's minds.

1. THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO THE HEATHEN WORLD AND TO THE ROMAN STATE, ON ITS INNER SIDE.

GOING back to the first beginning of this process of development, so vital to the history of the world, we see the least and the greatest confronting each other, Christianity on the one side, and the Roman Empire on the other. But the least in this instance not only carries in itself the germ of world-wide dominion; it also gives utterance from the very beginning and at every point of its development to its consciousness of possessing a power which should overcome the world. The world-consciousness expressed at the outset in the words of Jesus, when he said to his disciples that they were "the salt of the earth," is characteristic of Christianity in general. This was the guiding thought by which the Christians were inspired from the beginning and at a time when their outward situation offered the strongest contrast to these world-wide views. Though in various forms, this feeling never ceased to find significant expression among them. They are always more or less clearly conscious that they are the soul of the world, the substantial centre holding everything together, the pivot on which the world's history revolves, and those who alone have a future to look forward to. In his Apology, which was written in the reign of Marcus Aurelius about the year 170, Melito, the bishop of Sardis, reminds the Emperor and the Romans, that the appearance of Christianity in the world was contemporary with the reign of the Emperor Augustus, which was such an epoch in history; at that time, he says, the Roman Empire reached the highest point of its prosperity, and since that time both have been together in the world to their mutual advantage.¹ From his point of view he

¹ Eusebius, E. H. iv. 26. In the most important passage of this fragment Melito says, 'Ἡ γὰρ καθ' ἡμῶν φιλοσοφία (i.e. Christianity, which is spoken of in the same way in other passages of the writings of the Apologists; cp. Tatian, Or. c. Gr. 35) πρότερον μὲν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ἤκμασεν, ἐπανθήσασα δὲ τοῖς σοῖς ἔθνεσι κατὰ τὴν Αὐγούστου τοῦ σοῦ προγόνου μεγάλην ἀρχὴν, ἐγενήθη μάλιστα τῇ σὺ

naturally attributed the good fortune which had attended the Roman State since Augustus, to Christianity, as a new source of welfare now opened to the world. Even at that time, then, the Christians considered that in all essential respects the welfare of the Roman Empire depended on Christianity, and thus it was a natural and necessary inference from the fact of their co-existence, that the welfare of the world was established on a firm basis just in proportion to the closeness of the tie by which the two powers were connected into a unity. The same world-consciousness by which the Christians were inspired, appeared in the view of the world to which Tertullian, not yet turned Montanist, gave utterance when he said that the Christians alone delayed by their prayers the destruction of the world, and so kept the Roman Empire standing: that it was for their sake alone that God deferred the general dissolution.¹ Among the earlier doctors of the Church there is no

Βασιλεία αἴσιον ἀγαθόν, ἔκτοτε γὰρ εἰς μέγα καὶ λαμπρὸν τὸ Ῥωμαίων ηὐξήθη κράτος, οὗ σὺ διάδοχος εὐκταῖος γέγονάς τε καὶ ἔση μετὰ τοῦ παιδός, φυλάσσωσιν τῆς βασιλείας τὴν σύντροφον καὶ συναρξαμένην Αὐγούστου φιλοσοφίαν, ἣν καὶ οἱ πρόγονοί σου πρὸς ταῖς ἄλλαις θρησκειαῖς ἐτίμησαν. Καὶ τοῦτο μέγιστον τεκμήριον τοῦ πρὸς ἀγαθοῦ τὸν καθ' ἡμᾶς λόγον συνακμάσαι τῇ καλῶς ἀρξαμένῃ βασιλείᾳ ἐκ τοῦ μηδὲν φαῦλον ἀπὸ τῆς Αὐγούστου ἀρχῆς ἀπαντῆσαι, ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον ἅπαντα λαμπρὰ καὶ ἐνδοξα κατὰ τὰς πάντων εὐχάς. How apt and suggestive is the description of Christianity in its relation to the Roman State since Augustus, as the *σύντροφος* τῆς βασιλείας φιλοσοφία! Christianity and the Empire are, as it were, two brothers, bound together by the tie of a common infancy.

¹ Apolog. c. 32. Est et alia major necessitas nobis orandi pro Imperatoribus, etiam pro omni statu imperii, rebusque Romanis, qui vim maximam universo orbi imminet, ipsamque clausulam seculi, acerbitates horrendas comminantem, Romani imperii comineatu scimus retaritari. Itaque nolumus experiri, et dum precamur differri, Romanae diuturnitati favemus. C. 39. Oramus,—pro statu seculi, pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis. For the Montanist counterpart to this petition, see *supra*, vol. i. p. 248. Compare Justin, Apol. 2. 7; "Ὅθεν καὶ ἐπιμένει ὁ Θεὸς τὴν σύγχυσιν καὶ κατάλυσιν τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου μὴ ποιῆσαι, ἵνα καὶ οἱ φαῦλοι ἄγγελοι καὶ δαίμονες καὶ ἄνθρωποι μηκέτι ὄσι, διὰ τὸ σπέρμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὃ γινώσκει ἐν τῇ φύσει ὅτι αἰτίων ἐστίν. Ἐπεὶ εἰ μὴ τοῦτο ἦν, οὐκ ἂν οὐδὲ ὑμὶν ταῦτα ἔτι ποιεῖν καὶ ἐνεργεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων δυνατὸν ἦν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πῦρ τὸ τῆς κρίσεως κατελθόν, ἀνέδην πάντα διέκρινεν. The Christians are conscious of being the world-preserving principle. Everything in the world depends on them, and even what you heathens do against Christ is done under the condition, that for the sake of the Christians God will not yet let the world perish. Were it not for the Christians it would not be possible for you to do what you are doing, and to be incited thereto by the wicked demons.

one in whom this feeling was more alive, or by whom it was expressed with greater energy and beauty, than the unknown author of the *Epistola ad Diognetum*. After depicting in sharp antitheses the peculiar enigmatical life of the Christians, contrasting in so many points with the whole of their surroundings, he sums up his description of them in the proposition: "In a word, the Christians are in the world what the soul is in the body. The soul is diffused through all the members of the body: so are the Christians through the cities of the world. The soul dwells in the body, but is not of the body; so, the Christians dwell in the world, but are not of the world. The soul keeps watch invisible in the visible world: the Christians are seen living in the world, but their piety remains invisible. The flesh hates the soul and strives against it although uninjured by it, because it hinders the flesh from following its lusts: so does the world hate the Christians unjustly, because they oppose themselves to its lusts. The soul loves the flesh and the members which hate it, and the Christians love those who hate them. The soul is confined in the body, but holds the body together: and the Christians are held in the world as in a prison, but hold together even the world itself. The soul, immortal, dwells in the mortal body, and the Christians dwell in the corruptible, but look for incorruption in heaven. Such is the position which God has given the Christians in the world, and which no one can deny to them." Where there are men who feel themselves in this way to be the soul of the world, the time is indisputably approaching when the reins of the government of the world will fall unasked into their hands.

But before things had advanced so far, how much had to be surmounted, what repugnance, what detestation, what hatred and enmity against Christianity and its adherents had to be overcome in the minds of the heathen world! The view which the Christians held of heathenism was more than balanced by the view taken of Christianity by the heathens. To the Christians heathenism as a whole was the kingdom of demons who by falsehood and subtilty, and all the arts of deception, seduced men to worship them as gods. It was just because they had a special

hatred of whatever opens the eyes of men to the light of truth, and destroys the delusions with which they mock themselves, that they were the bitterest enemies of the Christians, and in spite of all the defeats they had to suffer, never paused in their hostile activity. The heathens, on the other hand, saw in the Christians a race hostile to mankind and hardly worthy of the human name,¹ and in Christianity itself, anything rather than an institution possessing the most distant claim to the name of a religion. Every sort of irreligion and immorality was laid at the door of Christianity. All the charges made against it, however, were included in the three accusations, which as we see from the writings of the apologists² were universally current, of ἀθεότης, of θνέσσεια δέιπνα and of οἰδιπόδαιοι μίξεις. That the Christians appeared to the heathens as atheists (ἄθεοι, as they are so often called) is very natural, since they not only refused to acknowledge the heathen gods, but also gave so little indication of having a religious cultus of their own. But the fact that they were believed to commit at their meetings such revolting acts as were only to be heard of in ancient myths dating from a time far antecedent to all civilisation and humanity, is a proof of more than ordinary hatred. From whatever source such charges may have flowed,³ as soon as they had

¹ Tert. Apol. cap. 37; hostes maluistis vocare generis humani (Christianos).

² Comp. Justin Apol. 1, 26; Dial. c. Tr. c. 10; Tatian Or. c. Gr. c. 25; Athenagoras Leg. c. 31; Tert. Apol. c. 7; Min. Felix Oct. c. 9; Origenes c. Cels. 6, 27, 40.

³ The expressions are taken from old Greek myths, but this does not prevent us from assuming that the chief originators of the charges were Jews. Quod enim aliud genus seminarium est infamiae nostrae? says Tertullian, ad Nat. i. 14. The lies and calumnies of the Talmud are analogous. See *infra*, p. 143. The primary occasion of the charges is doubtless to be found in the custom of the primitive Christians to come together at night in memory of that night in which the Lord was betrayed, and before he was betrayed celebrated the Eucharist with his disciples (1 Cor. xi. 23), and in the terms flesh and blood, with which the principal act of their meeting was indicated. The chief accusation was thus that of ἀνθρωποφαγία, and Tatian, Or. cap. 25, does nothing more than simply protest against it. But even Justin, Apol. i. 26, was aware that the Christians were charged not only with ἀνθρωπείων σάρκων βορᾶι, but also with λυγρίας ἀνατροπή, and ἀνέδην μίξεις, the latter being believed to follow the former (Dial. cap. 10). In Tertullian we see this worked up to a scene which unites in itself, in a word, everything horrible that could serve to inflame the popular fancy against such a

obtained general circulation as popular rumours, they were not only spun out to greater length in fabulous narratives, but the universal prejudice caused them to be the more readily believed. Indeed they seemed to derive confirmation from many of those features in which the Christians were distinguished from the Jews and heathens, distinctions which, as Christianity spread, became more and more noticeable. Such were their habit of holding their meetings at night, the meals which were customary at those meetings, the intimate brotherhood which they cultivated with each other, awaking the suspicion of a secret connection, their timid manner of life, retiring from men, and withdrawing themselves from public life, and many other traits of this kind. This accordingly was that *exitiabilis superstitio*, notorious on account of the flagitia connected with it, as Tacitus calls Christianity: a judgment of great interest to us, since it must be allowed to count as the expression of the genuine Roman view of that age. To understand this expression aright, and to comprehend the fact that not only the great mass of the people, but even the men of highest cultivation could

sect. *Dicimur sceleratissimi de sacramento infanticidii et pabulo inde, et post convivium incesto, quod eversores luminum canes, lenones scilicet tenebrarum, libidinum impiarum in verecundiam procurent. Apol. c. 7. Cp. ad Nat. l. 7: Infans—qui imoletur et panis aliquantum, qui in sanguine infringatur: præterea candelabra, quæ canes annexi deturbent, et offulæ, quæ eosdem canes.*

Minucius Felix, Oct. c. 9, makes his heathen Caecilius narrate in still greater detail the *detestanda fabula*, the action of which is specially intended for the *initiandi tirunculi*. The same story meets us afterwards in a changed form in connection with the Manichees of the Middle Ages. Here the child is the fruit of the concubitus, which is described in the same way as formerly, and the ashes of his body, burned after eight days, have the demonic power of retaining for ever in connection with the sect him who has eaten even a small portion of them. The devil now plays a part in the transaction along with the demons. The legend of the *Euchites* who came from Western Asia to Thrace had passed over to these Manichees. Of the *Euchites* Michael Psellus, writing about the middle of the eleventh century (*De operatione demonum*, ed. Boissonade, Norimb. 1838, p. 8), tells the same story of the nightly extinction of lights and incestuous sexual intercourse, of the murder and burning of the children who were born from these unions, and the magic influence of their ashes mixed with their blood. Between this form of the fable, where old oriental ideas of demons and their works of darkness have been at work upon it (cp. *Das manichäische Religionssystem*, p. 134 sq.), and that old simple form, Tertullian's *sacramentum infanticidii* is the middle link; but where did this notion itself come from?

pass such a judgment, it is necessary to bear in mind another fact which is unmistakably presented to us in Tacitus, that Christianity as it arose out of Judaea (the *origo. hujus mali*), was considered to be merely an outcome of Judaism, and to contain, only in an intensified degree, all those elements which when they met them in Judaism excited in the Romans the most thorough-going national antipathy.¹ Of the character of the Jews, so opposed to the ideas, manners, and customs of all other people, and all those elements which made them in their own way so peculiar a nation, Tacitus could give no other explanation than to refer them to that hatred and enmity against all others with which they had from the beginning been filled, and which was the true principle of their nationality. Of the Christians he now has to say that their characteristic feature was *odium generis humani*; so that it seemed that they were necessarily excluded from the whole of the civilised and cultivated world. In fact, looking upon men of such cultivation and such views as those of Tacitus as the genuine representatives of the Romans of that time, we see that no two things could be more incompatible, or present a greater antithesis, than Christianity and the Roman Empire as it then was, and that the relation between them must have been one of simple repugnance and antagonism. We can scarcely conceive how the faith of a sect which had public opinion so much against it in all the strata of society, from the lowest to the highest, could ever overcome so great a chasm. And yet this by no means prevented Christianity from extending the limits of its power, originally so contracted, further and further. In the second half of the second century its opponents insisted on the fact which they deemed to be a reproach to Christianity,² that it found its supporters neither among the great mass of the people, nor among the cultivated

¹ The two descriptions given by Tacitus, first in his *History*, v. 2 *sq.*, of the Jews, and then in his *Annals*, xv. 44, of the Christians, mutually complement one another. In writing of the former the latter were always present to his mind. The whole impression which Judaism made upon him is expressed with great emphasis in the words, *Judaeorum mos absurdus sordidusque*.

² Comp. Celsus, in *Orig. c. Cels.* iii. 55.

class, but only among those who belonged to the ordinary citizen-class, among artisans and those who preferred to keep by themselves and avoided publicity. We could have no better picture of the quiet power by which Christianity attracted men's minds to itself and gradually and persistently extended the circle of its influence. Its converts were those who, in the barren void left in their religious consciousness by the disappearance of faith in the old gods, felt the need of some new spiritual matter to fill up that void, and who were attracted by the quiet, meditative religiousness of the Christians, by their self-denying taste for poverty in the midst of a luxury-loving world, and by their firm and hearty attachment to each other, at a time when the most important social ties were suffering almost universal dissolution. These things attracted them not less than that consolation which the Gospel promised to the conscience, and the expectation, aroused so powerfully by the belief in the parousia, of the great catastrophe, for which men were exhorted to hold themselves prepared. Christianity had thus, by the secret power which it exercised over men's spirits, won over to itself a much larger proportion of the heathen population than could be outwardly discerned; and when its advances became more evident, and violent measures were resorted to in order to check them, the consequence was only what Tertullian urges upon the heathen at the close of his *Apology*: *Nec quicquam proficit exquisitior quaeque crudelitas vestra, illecebra est magis sectae, plures efficimur, quoties metimur a vobis, semen est sanguis Christianorum*. It was just when such persecutions were being carried on, that men of philosophic culture began to go over to Christianity in greater numbers. The admiration which was forced from them by the steadfastness of the Christian martyrs compelled them to acknowledge that a doctrine which could inspire its confessors with such contempt of death must rest on a more than superficial truth, and must be as far as possible removed from being a promoter of sensual enjoyment.¹ As philosophers they were accustomed to consider that the chief task of philosophy was the carrying out of

¹ Justin, *Apol.* ii. 12.

its principles in the practice of its followers : and so Christianity with the strictly moral tendency which it exhibited in practice, appeared to them in the light of a philosophy, and after they became Christians they continued, only under another name, the same kind of life, a life devoted to philosophy, which they had formerly followed as philosophers.¹ What Justin, the philosopher and martyr, tells us of the motives which led him to go over to Christianity,² may doubtless be regarded as the history of the conversion of many a man of the same bent of mind besides. To us Justin is the chief representative of those men who may be classed together under the name of apologists of Christianity. By the mere fact that men such as they were, men familiar with Greek culture and philosophy, had gone over to Christianity out of the hostile camp, they initiated a new epoch of the relations of Christianity to the heathen world.

The task of the apologists was, generally speaking, to justify Christianity in the eyes of the world which stood over against it, and especially in the eyes of those who wielded the greatest influence over the relations subsisting between Christianity and the Roman State, and over the public life of the Christians and their position generally. The way in which they sought to gain this end was that they took up the coarse charges which were circulated against the Christians, and showed how absurd and frivolous they were, that they considered and tried to remove the prejudices which opposed Christianity in popular opinion, and that they entered upon detailed explanations with regard to the doctrines and principles of the Christians, their manners and usages, and their whole social and moral conduct, and so sought to prepare the way for a more accurate idea of the nature of Christianity, and to create a conviction that no danger to the state was to be feared from the Christians. The main point of all was that Christianity should be known to

¹ Even after becoming Christians they wore the philosopher's pallium. Cf. Justin, *Dial. c. Jud. Tryph. c. 1* ; Tertullian, *de Pallio, c. 6*. *Gaude, pallium et exulta, melior jam te philosophia dignata est, ex quo Christianum vestire coepisti.* Neander, *Antignosticus*, p. 307 (Bohn's translation, ii. 423).

² *Dial. cap. 8.*

be what according to its true nature it was. If once it were known as being what it was, it seemed that it would not be possible to refuse it toleration in civil society. But the apologists went further than this. If the charges which the heathens made against Christianity were such that the relation of Christianity to the whole heathen world appeared to be one of the utmost repugnance and antagonism, the idea which the apologists entertained of that relation was not less exaggerated, only on the other side. Far from its being the fact that Christianity was a thing new and unheard of, which had all at once come into the world merely to oppose all that had passed till then for manners, humanity, and culture, and to the universal detestation of mankind; if men would but open their eyes, the apologists considered, they would behold the plainest proofs of its presence everywhere, in the midst of the heathen world, and even before the appearance of Christianity. As the Jews, when the Christians sought to convince them of the truth and divinity of Christianity, were directed to the Old Testament, and told that in that volume, if only its deeper spiritual meaning were rightly understood, everything was contained that belonged to the peculiar nature of Christianity, that all the facts of the Gospel history, to the smallest particulars, were to be found there in type and prophecy; so it was held that the strongest point of the apologies directed to the heathens lay in demonstrating to them, that even in the midst of the heathen world they were Christians without knowing it, that Christianity was present with them as the immanent truth of their own consciousness. There could certainly be nothing stronger than Justin's apostrophe to the heathen,¹ where, seeking to bring the truth of Christianity as clearly as possible before their eyes,

¹ Apol. i. 55. Compare Tertullian Apol. c. 16: Qui crucis nos religiosos putat, consecraneus noster erit.—Pars crucis est omne robur, quod erecta statione defigitur; nos si forte, integrum et totum Deum colimus. Diximus (c. 12) originem deorum vestrorum a plasticis de cruce induci. Sed et victorias adoratis, cum in tropæis cruces intestina sicut tropæorum. Religio Romana tota castrensis signa veneratur, signa jurat, signa omnibus diis præponit. Omnes illi imaginum suggestus insignes monilia crucum sunt.

he points them to the figure of the cross which was everywhere present to them, and puts the question before them how they can continue in their unbelief, when in all the instruments they use in their handicrafts, their navigation and their agriculture, in the upright figure by which man is distinguished from the brutes, even in the banners and signs of victory which they use on public occasions as the symbols of their power and rule, and in the images of their departed emperors, the universal significance of the cross confronts them. And yet what a light does this argument shed upon the peculiar ways of looking upon things which those men must have had when Christianity, far from presenting a contrast to the world around them, had for the first time brought them to a clear consciousness with regard to what they had been and what they had had before them before they became Christians. And even though a view like this was, in the first instance, a mere vague play of the fancy, yet these men knew where to find deeper and more real foundation for their Christian universalism. It is not to be considered fortuitous that at the very time when it was so earnestly desired to bring Christianity nearer to the consciousness of the heathen world, and to minimize the difference which separated it from heathenism, the idea of the Logos became a ruling idea of the age. In the form which it has notably with Justin, it was quite peculiarly fitted to form a link between the Christian and the non-Christian elements of the time. The Logos who became man not only foretold the future in the Jewish prophets, but in the heathen world also brought about all that is to be found there of true and reasonable. Accordingly, Justin goes so far as to assert quite broadly that the reasonable is, as such, also Christian. All who have lived reasonably (*μετὰ λόγου*) are Christians, even though they were accounted as godless. All the excellent works of philosophers and legislators were accomplished by them not without a certain participation in the Logos; only they did not know the whole Logos, and hence they have frequently contradicted one another.¹ In defining this relation

¹ *Apol.* i. 46; ii. 10, 13.

Justin makes use of the Stoic doctrine of the λόγος σπερματικός; what the Logos is as the general reason in his unity and totality is thus distinguished from that which he is in a particular manner in individuals. The difference between the Christian and the non-Christian according to this view (which is also that which underlies the view of the world of Clement of Alexandria), is, that what Christianity is absolutely, since the whole Logos appeared in it, is also to be found outside Christianity, but only in a relative and particular manner, only imperfectly and fragmentarily; and this is the reason why what the Logos has operated spermatically has never penetrated into the general consciousness of mankind in such a way that it could have become the faith of the uneducated, and that it never called forth such enthusiasm, and such a capacity of self-sacrifice for the cause of truth, as the Christians showed by their contempt of death. This is what makes the difference between Socrates and Christ, great as the analogy is in many respects; and yet, inasmuch as in the notion of the Logos the Christian is essentially the rational, there is a very close inner relation between the Christian and the non-Christian, and Christianity everywhere encounters, even in the heathen world, elements of affinity and points of connection, of which it can lay hold. As Justin declares that the rational is also Christian, so Tertullian perceived in those simplest expressions of the religious consciousness, in which the heathen turned away without being aware of it from the polytheistic element of his idea of God, a *testimonium animae naturaliter christianae*.¹ This being so, it was not only legitimate, but necessary to do, what indeed a dialectical view of the facts commanded, viz. go back to the original and immediate, which was the necessary presupposition of polytheistic belief; and thus Christians and heathens stand on the same basis of universal reason and natural consciousness of God, and what is found in Christianity is the clear and picture-like expression for the popular consciousness, through the Logos made man, of that which every one must recognise as the essentially true and reasonable.

¹ De Testimonio Animae, c. 1 sq. Apolog. c. 17.

What immediate impression these apologies produced, or if they even reached the hands of those for whom they were primarily intended, we do not know. There can be no doubt, however, as to the broad general fact that they contributed essentially to the result that the attention of an ever widening public was directed to Christianity, and that Christianity came to be seen in a quite different aspect from formerly. In place of the obscure popular rumours which had till now been so frequently the source of the information people had about Christianity, there were now literary works which it was impossible to disregard, and which afforded to every one who took an interest in the subject an opportunity of forming his own independent opinion upon it. Indeed these works challenged their readers to form such an opinion, and incited them to do so by the tone in which they were written. The more a man's acquaintance with Christianity extended, the less possible was it for him to close his eyes to the importance it had acquired as a new phenomenon of the age. Men could not but feel the necessity for going seriously and thoroughly into the question what was the state of the case with regard to Christianity, what there was in it, what claim it had to be considered true. It was impossible now to ignore it, or merely to put it aside with scorn and contempt. If a man could place no belief in Christianity, it was necessary to go a step further and make an attempt to refute it; and as such investigations brought into ever clearer light the whole wide difference between the Christian and the heathen views of the world, men were forced to go back to the ultimate principles on which the one and the other were based.

That among the enemies of Christianity in the second half of the second century there were not wanting men who were impressed to the utmost with the importance of this question, is proved by the remarkable work written against Christianity by the Greek philosopher Celsus. Of Celsus himself we have no further knowledge.¹ The title of his work was *ἀληθὲς λόγος*, and

¹ Who this Celsus was, against whom Origen wrote his famous apologetical work, it is not now possible to make out; even Origen knew no further details about

by it he doubtless meant to indicate the love of truth which had induced him to enter upon this refutation of Christianity. The work itself has been lost, but the abundant extracts from it preserved by Origen in the eight books of his reply, sufficiently attest the earnestness with which he pursued his aim, and the pains and care which he expended on the work. Not only was he acquainted with the original documents of the religion of the Christians—and it can be clearly proved that he knew several of the writings which stand to this day in the canon of the New Testament—he was also familiar with the principles, usages, and institutions of the Christians, the parties into which they were divided, and in fact with everything that characterised the Christians of the time, and appeared strange to a heathen antagonist. He is second to none of the assailants of Christianity in acuteness of mind, in dialectical skill, and in varied culture, both philosophical and general, and not seldom it creates a feeling of surprise

him. The different facts to be considered in connection with the question are the following:—According to the statement of Origen, i. 8, there were two men of the name of Celsus, who were both Epicureans; one of whom lived under Nero, the other under Hadrian and later. We can only have to do with the latter one here. That this Celsus (whom Origen is inclined to consider to be the Celsus against whom he wrote) was an Epicurean, Origen thought (*loc. cit.*) quite clearly proved by his other writings. He also mentions, iv. 36, other writings composed by one named Celsus an Epicurean, and speaks of two books written against the Christians. Further, Origen was acquainted with several books written by a Celsus against magic (i. 68), but though he generally holds his Celsus to be a disguised Epicurean, or the well-known Epicurean Celsus, yet in i. 68 he is uncertain if he is the author of the works against magic. In Lucian's *Pseudomantis* we find an Epicurean Celsus, who also wrote against the magicians. It was at the suggestion of his friend Celsus that Lucian wrote the history of Alexander of Abonoteichos, a notorious sorcerer, about the middle of the second century, who gave himself out for a prophet; this work was dedicated to Celsus, and in it Lucian speaks very highly in praise of Epicurus. There can be no doubt that the Celsus of Lucian is the Epicurean Celsus whom Origen knew from his other writings; but whether this Celsus is also the adversary of Christianity whom Origen refutes, is very doubtful: and in fact it is scarcely possible to suppose that he is, since the latter is a pronounced Platonist in his philosophical views and principles, and it is scarcely conceivable that he was really an Epicurean or even an eclectic. It is scarcely possible to arrive at a distinct result as to the person of Celsus, although the question has been so often discussed. (Compare especially Bindemann, *über Celsus und seine Schrift gegen die Christen*,

when we find him insisting very aptly and pertinently on those same general and far-reaching considerations to which all the subsequent assailants of Christianity have returned, although raising them in other forms, and from very different standpoints. It is thus of the greatest interest not only to make ourselves acquainted with the chief points of his contention against Christianity, but also, and this perhaps most of all, to find an answer to the question what judgment yielded itself to him at last out of all the studies and discussions he had taken in hand in various directions, as to the general nature and character of Christianity, and what was that general view formed by the age as to the relation of Christianity to the world confronting it, which his judgment reflects to us.

The work of Celsus seems to have been arranged very methodically, and even to some extent artistically; but on this point the materials for a distinct judgment are wanting, as Origen while regularly following the work of his opponent in its connection, in Illgen's *Zeitschr. für histor. Theol.* 1842, p. 58 sq.). Yet a more correct interpretation of the passage iv. 36, than that usually given, would probably show that the two Celsus whose identity or distinctness from each other is in question,—the Celsus refuted by Origen and the Celsus generally known as the Epicurean—may be clearly distinguished from each other. In this passage Origen calls his Celsus an Epicurean, but adds, *εἶπε οὗτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἄλλα δύο βιβλία συντάξας*. Neander, *K.-G.* i. 274 (Bohn i. 222), has justly remarked that the books here spoken of can be no others than that one work which Origen wrote to refute; that Origen's doubt was simply whether the Epicurean could be the writer of that work. Whether or not he wrote two other books against the Christians was a point with which Origen had no concern here. The only point which Neander has failed to explain is how, if Origen had in his eye here that one work of Celsus, he could yet speak of *δύο βιβλία*. This, however, is fully explained by a remark made by Origen to Ambrosius at the end of his work, viii. 76. He tells Ambrosius that Celsus had announced his intention to write another work after this one, in which he would show how those are to live who wish to follow him and are able to do so. If he left this promised work unwritten, then the eight books written in refutation of his work might suffice; but if he had begun and finished it, Origen asks Ambrosius to inquire for the work and send it to him, that he might reply to it also. Without doubt, when Origen speaks of *δύο βιβλία*, he means the book against which he was writing and the other which he refers to in viii. 76. In iv. 36 he takes it for granted that Celsus had actually carried out that intention. Thus in any case there was only one Celsus who wrote against the Christians, not two.

yet passed over a great deal of it, thus leaving it uncertain how far the frequent repetitions and digressions which are found in Celsus according to Origen, are to be put down to the account of the original author. We are able, however, to infer something more as to the arrangement of the work from observing how the materials are apportioned to the various personages. Before Celsus appears in his own person a Jew comes forward to take the part of Judaism, and the author's objections are placed in his mouth. The object of this was not only to give dramatic life to the scene of the controversy, but also, and chiefly, to eliminate those parts of the dispute which the Jew could bring forward from his own point of view, and so to give more sharpness and weight to those principal objections which formed the loftier contention of the heathen opponent, and the ultimate decision regarding which was only to be found in philosophy. In this distribution of the parts the Jew had to take up all the points affecting the credibility and inner probability of the evangelical history. He attacks the narrative of the birth of Jesus of the Virgin, and maintains that his mother was a poor woman who supported herself by her own labour, and whom her husband had convicted of adultery. Cast off and wandering about, in her shameful retirement she gave birth to Jesus, who, being forced by poverty to take service in Egypt, learned secret arts there which he practised on his return, and by means of which he obtained such success that he called himself a god.¹ Celsus very correctly put this accusation in the mouth of his Jew; he appears to have taken it from a tradition which was doubtless current among the Jews of the time.² Most of his other objections are rather negative in their nature; he seeks to

¹ i. 28.

² i. 32. Origen quotes from Celsus, that the father of Jesus was a soldier of the name of Panthera. In the Talmud also Jesus is called יֵשׁוּעַ בֶּן פְּנִינָה. The name, as Nitzsch points out (Theol. stud. u. Krit., 1840, i. 115), is tantamount to son of the courtesan. The word passed into Chaldee from Greek, where πάνθηρ, panthera, like the Latin lupa, was a figure of greedy lust, avaricious wantonness, of a woman who hunts after all, ἀπὸ τοῦ πᾶν θηρᾶν. It is thus simply another expression for the notion of πορνεία.

demonstrate the unworthy and improbable elements to be found in the Gospel narrative. Thus he asks with respect to the birth of Jesus, whether his mother was beautiful, and God was enamoured of her on account of her beauty; and how it agrees with the kingdom of God, that he allowed her to be cast out?¹ Again, why the child Jesus was removed to Egypt: was God also afraid of death? True, an angel came from heaven with the command to flee; but could not the great God, who had already sent two angels on account of Jesus, have kept his own son safe at home? From his death one might see that he had not such blood as, according to Homer, flows in the veins of the blessed gods. The old myths of sons of God, of a Perseus, Amphion, Aeacus, Minos, deserve no credence, and yet the great and wonderful deeds of these personages add credit to the stories: but what great thing was accomplished by Jesus in word or deed? Although the Jews challenged him in the temple to show himself, by a miracle that they could see, to be the Son of God, yet he did nothing.² How could they hold one for a god who not only failed to do aught of what he promised, but also, when the Jews convicted and condemned him, and judged him worthy of death, hid himself, was seized in a disgraceful flight, and betrayed by those who were called his disciples? A god should not have fled, nor have been taken away bound; but least of all should he who was counted the Redeemer, the son of the great God, and an angel, have been forsaken and betrayed by those who were with him, who lived in his intimate intercourse and shared everything with him, and looked to him as their teacher.³ The Jew laid special stress upon the fact that Jesus was betrayed by his own disciples. This, he said, was a thing which had never happened to any good general, even with many myriads of men under his command; indeed any captain of robbers knew how to bind his people by goodwill to himself.⁴ The predictions of Jesus with regard to his own fate were also the subject of various objections. What God or demon or man of understanding, if he knew that such things were to befall him,

¹ i. 39.² i. 66, 67.³ ii. 9.⁴ ii. 12.

would not choose to get out of the way rather than thrust himself into them? If he predicted to one of his disciples that he would betray him, and to another that he would deny him, how was it that they were not so much in awe of him as a god, as to be restrained the one from betraying, and the other from denying, him? But if he predicted this as a god, then it was necessary that the prediction should be fulfilled. In this case God made his disciples and prophets, who ate and drank with him—and men do not use to inflict any injury on their companions at table—become guilty of criminal and impious acts.¹ As little can the opponent comprehend how any one could prove himself to be God and the Son of God in such a way as this is said to have been done by Jesus. As the sun manifests itself simply by illuminating all, so ought the Son of God to have done. What did he do in this respect that was worthy of God? did he feel contempt for men, and laugh at the things which happened to him? Why did he not show himself as God, if not before, yet at last? why did he not set himself free from the shame, and revenge himself and his Father on those who were offering him violence? How, the Jew asks, could the Jews be blamed that they did not hold him to be a god, nor, in the conviction that he had suffered for the benefit of men, take such things upon them, when he himself was unable, as long as he lived, to persuade his own disciples to take such a view of his death? Is it not, he argues with the Christians, a contradiction, that they should die with him, while those who were with him in his lifetime, who heard his voice and enjoyed the benefit of his teaching, when they saw him suffer and die, did not die either with him or for him, and were not to be moved to contempt of death?² Of all the objections belonging to the same category, it may suffice us here, after quoting so many, to mention those referring to the resurrection of Jesus. How, the Jew asks, is a man to persuade himself that it took place? Granted that it was announced beforehand, there are many others who have found it to be their interest to persuade credulous people by such an allega-

¹ ii. 20.² ii. 30-45.

tion, as Zamolxis, the slave of Pythagoras, among the Scythians, Pythagoras himself in Italy, Ramsinut in Egypt, Orpheus among the Odrysae, Protesilaus in Thessaly, Hercules in Taenarus, and Theseus. But it must be asked, whether any one who actually died had ever risen again with the same body. How could the Christians believe that the statements of others were mere myths, but that their drama had had, not only the cry upon the cross at the death of Jesus, and the earthquake and the darkness, but further, the most glorious and convincing catastrophe, that he who could not help himself when living rose again when dead, and showed the signs of the death he had endured, and his pierced hands? Who saw it? A fanatical woman, as they themselves allege, or others belonging to the same band of sorcerers. Those who saw it were prepared by their temperament to dream of it, or else they wished it, and the wish took shape in their fancy, as has been the case with many another; or else, what is still more credible, they desired to amaze other people by such a miracle, and to work into the hands of other charlatans. If Jesus had wanted to give a true revelation of his divine power, he ought to have appeared to his enemies, to his judges, in fact to all; or, if it was in his power to give such a proof of his divinity, he ought to have disappeared from the cross at once. From all this and other arguments of the same kind, the Jew draws the conclusion that Jesus was a man, and such a man as truth shows him to have been, and reason allows us to recognise in him.¹

Celsus himself speaks of the part which is given to the Jew in play as merely the prelude of his dialectical contest with Christianity. The dispute between Jews and Christians is in his eyes so foolish as to be compared with the proverbial dispute about the shadow of an ass. The points in dispute between Jews and Christians are of no importance; both believe that the Holy Spirit has prophesied the advent of a Redeemer of mankind; what they contend about is merely whether the object of the prophecy has come or not. What has now to be done is accordingly to impu-

¹ ii. 55, 63, 68, 79.

those presuppositions on which both Jews and Christians proceed, and with them, of course, the supernatural view of the world on which both these religions are based. Before coming forward with the weightier arguments which belong to this place, he expresses in various turns of thought his general view of Christianity, which is that, generally speaking, he finds nothing in it deserving of respect and acceptance. Christianity as a whole reposes on no real foundation of reason. As the Jews broke away from the Egyptians on account of a religious dispute, so with the Christians also, caprice and the desire of innovation, sedition, and sectarianism compose the element in which they move. Only on these things and on the fear which they inspire in others, especially through the terrifying pictures which they draw of future punishments, do they found their faith.¹ Far more reasonable than the Christians with their belief in Jesus, are the Greeks with their belief in Heracles, Asclepios, Dionysos, who, though men, were because of their meritorious acts accounted gods, with their legends of Aristeas of Proconnesus, the Hyperborean Abaris, Hermotimus of Clazomenae, Cleomedes of Astypalaea, who, though the same things were told of them as of Jesus, were not therefore held to be gods. The cultus which the Christians offered to their Jesus was not better than the cultus of Antinous by Hadrian: they have no reason to laugh at the worshippers of Zeus because his grave was pointed out in Crete; they did not know what the real meaning of the Cretans was, and they themselves worship a buried man.² What sort of a thing Christianity was might easily be seen from the circumstance that no man of cultivation, no wise or reasonable man, goes to them; but ignorant and foolish people may go to them with confidence; such persons do they hold to be worthy of their God, and they openly declare that they neither will nor can have any others among them. As the Christians of that age belonged for the most part to the lower orders, Celsus made great use of this fact in collecting the characteristics of Christianity. The Christians appeared to him to belong to the class of those who move about

¹ iii. 5 *sq.*, 14.

² iii. 22, 26 *sq.*, 36, 43.

in public places with their low trades, and do not enter any respectable society. In the houses one meets with workers in wool, shoemakers, dyers, uncultivated and unmannered people who do not dare to open their mouths before the masters of the house, men of more cultivation and ability; but if once they get a hold of the children and wives, they speak the most extraordinary things, and represent to them that they should not hold to their fathers and teachers, but only follow them; their fathers and teachers, they say, are under the power of vanity, and can do nothing right; they alone know how one ought to live, and if the children follow them they will be happy and make the house fortunate.¹ Celsus thinks this not too harsh a judgment on the Christians. A still greater reproach which he brings against them is that while in other mysteries it is the pure, those who are not conscious of guilt, those who have lived good and righteous lives, who are summoned to purge themselves from their transgressions, the Christians, on the contrary, promise to every sinner, every fool, every miserable person, that he will be received into the kingdom of God. Celsus takes special offence at that preference which Christianity gives to sinners, and its doctrine of the forgiveness of sins. He holds broadly that forgiveness of sins is not possible; every one knows, he says, that those who have confirmed by habit their natural tendency to sin are not changed by punishment, and still less by indulgence. Entirely to change our nature is the most difficult thing of all. Nor does the forgiveness of sins allow of being harmonised with the idea of God. According to the Christian representation of him, God is like those who allow themselves to be softened by pity; out of pity on the wretched he makes it easy to the bad; but the good, who do nothing wrong, he rejects. Christians

¹ iii. 50, 52, 55. Möhler, Bruchstücke aus der Geschichte der Aufhebung der Sklaverei, Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze, vol. ii. 1840, p. 85, thinks that the *ἐπιουργοί, σκυτοτόμοι, κναφεῖς*, are slaves, and quotes this passage to prove that the Christians were very active and successful in the work of converting slaves. But there is no hint of this in the passage, and it is not correct to suppose that artisans such as those named were invariably slaves in those times. Why the distinctions among them, if the writer merely meant to signify that they were slaves?

think, indeed, that God can do anything; but it is plain that their doctrine cannot obtain the approval of any reasonable man.¹

Even in these general aspects, then, Christianity fails to commend itself to reason, but its contrariety to reason becomes still more apparent, when inquiry is made as to the ultimate grounds on which Christianity rests. It presupposes a special manifestation and revelation of God; it is to the notion of revelation that one comes ultimately in seeking the reason of Christianity. Celsus attacks this notion with arguments which have been brought forward again and again from his time downwards, to disprove the possibility of revelation in general; and he not only does this, but he reduces the main question at issue to the great difference between the theistic and the pantheistic views of the world, in such a way as to exhibit the whole width of the difference between the two standpoints.

The question at issue between Christians and Jews, whether God, or the Son of God, has already descended to the earth, or is still about to descend, is, he holds, a contemptible subject of contention; the question is, What rational conception can be formed of such a descent of God at all? ² Why, Celsus asks, did God descend to the earth? To see how things were going with men? But did he not know everything? He knew it, did he? And yet he did not set it right, and could not set it right with his divine power. He could not set it right without some one being sent down for this purpose. Perhaps he wished, since he was still unknown to men, and considered that on that account something was wanting to him, to be known by them, and to see who would and who would not believe. To this Celsus himself gives the answer, that as far as God is concerned he has no need to be known, but that he gives us the knowledge of himself for our profit, and then he asks, why did so long a time elapse before God conceived the notion of setting the life of men right; did he never think of that before? ³ To get still closer to the root of the matter, Celsus goes back to the notion of God. He says he has no intention of saying anything new, but

¹ iii. 63, 65, 70, 71.

² iv. 2, 3.

³ iv. 8.

only what has long been recognised. God is good, beautiful, blessed; he is the sum of all that is fairest and best. If he descends to men, a change must take place, but this change is a transition from good to bad, from beautiful to ugly, from blessed to unblessed; and who could wish for such a change for himself? Again, while it belongs to the nature of the mortal that it can change and be transformed, the immortal remains always equal to itself. Thus such a change as Christianity presupposes is essentially impossible for God. The Christians think that God can actually change himself into a mortal body, but as this is impossible, we should be driven to think that without actually undergoing it, he gave himself the appearance of such a change for those who saw him. But if this were the case, he would be lying and deceiving. Lies and deceit are always bad, and are only to be used as remedies, either in the case of friends, to cure them when they are ill and out of their senses, or as against enemies, to escape from a danger. But neither can be the case with God.¹ If, however, although the thing is intrinsically impossible, it be supposed that a revelation has actually taken place, it is necessary that we be able to think of some definite object which it was to serve. The believer in revelation can only regard the world from the point of view of teleology; but the teleological view of the world leads to particularism, and particularism cannot be dissociated from an anthropomorphic and anthropopathic conception of God. Such is the train of thought in which the polemic of Celsus proceeds in this part of his work, where the highest question of principle in philosophy comes to be discussed. According to the assertion of the Jews, Celsus says, since life is filled with all sorts of wickedness, it is necessary that a messenger should come from God to punish the wicked and purify all things, in the same way as at the flood. The Christians modify this statement, and say that the Son of God has already been sent because of the sins of the Jews, and that the Jews, because they punished him with death and gave him gall (*χολή*) to drink, have drawn down upon themselves the wrath (*χόλος*) of

¹ iv. 14, 18.

God. The scorn of Celsus at once fastens upon this. Jews and Christians alike are compared to a flock of bats, or to ants that creep forth out of their nest, or to frogs sitting round a swamp, or worms holding an assembly in a corner in the mud, and debating on the question which of them are the greatest sinners. It is to us, they say, that God declares everything before it comes to pass; for our sake he leaves the whole world, heaven and earth, and comes to sojourn with us; to us alone does he send his messengers, and he cannot cease sending one messenger after another, because it is of the greatest importance to him that we should be with him always. The worms say: God is, and we are next after him, in all things like to him; he has put everything in subjection to us, earth, water, air, and stars; all things are for our sake, and are intended for our service; but because there are some of us who have erred, God will come, or will send his Son to burn up the wicked and cause the rest to have eternal life with him.¹ This indicates very suggestively the turn which the argument of Celsus here takes with a view to a special attack now to be made on the Old Testament, and a clear demonstration of the anthropopathism of the Christian notion of God as connected with the Old Testament history of revelation. The Jews and Christians, he says, can only be compared with such animals as those above named, inasmuch as the Jews are runaway slaves from Egypt, and have never done anything to distinguish themselves. In order to trace their descent from the most ancient jugglers and beggars, they appeal to ancient ambiguous and mysterious sayings which they explain to ignorant and foolish people. Sitting in their corner in Palestine, they invented, knowing nothing, in their entire want of all culture, of Hesiod and other inspired men, the rudest and most incredible history of the creation. Here Celsus turns aside to the Old Testament history, and ridicules the absurdities which he finds in it. It is true that many Jews and Christians explain it allegorically, but that only proves that they themselves are ashamed of these things.² All this, however, is only meant to lend force to the

¹ iv. 23.

² iv. 31 *sq.*, 48 *sq.*

contrast which Celsus draws between this materialistic style of thought, in which the nature of God is drawn so low down into the human and the earthly, and the Platonic view, according to which God made nothing that is mortal, but only what is immortal; only the soul is the work of God, the body has another nature. As the nature of the whole is ever one and the same, so there is always the same measure of evils in the world.¹ Evil is not from God, but is attached to matter and to mortal natures, in whose periodical change past, present, and future remain ever the same. Thus man is not the object of the world at all, but all individual existences arise and pass away solely for the preservation of the whole, and what appears to one or other of them to be an evil is not in itself evil if it is of advantage to the whole. In order to refute the teleological position that God made everything for man, which is the basis of the Christian revelation, and to leave no part of it standing, Celsus enters into a detailed comparison of men with the brutes, in which he finds a set-off on the side of the latter for every advantage which he allows to the former; and so far is this argument carried that men are made to stand rather below than above the brutes. At the close of this argument he expresses his general view of the world in the words: "the world, then, is not made for man, for him as little as for the lion or the dolphin or the eagle; it is made solely to be a work of God perfect in itself in all its parts; the individuals in it have reference to each other only in so far as they have reference to the whole. God cares for the whole, his providence forsakes it not, it does not grow worse; nor does God retire for a time into himself; he is angry at men as little as he is angry at apes or flies; all the particular parts of the world have received their definite and appropriate place."² This is in the main the view which has continued from the time of Celsus to the most modern times to be the chief opponent of the supranaturalistic belief in revelation, and the development of which, from the rude form which it has with Celsus to a theory founded in philosophy, has only rendered

¹ iv. 54, 62.² iv. 99.

it the more dangerous. If the world is a whole, complete in itself, then God and the world are essentially connected with each other, and can only be thought in a relation of immanence to each other. All particular, teleological, supernatural elements at once disappear in the all-embracing unity of the whole, and the notion of revelation loses its whole justification, its root in the philosophy of things being cut away; for if there is no God different from the world, standing above the world, and operating on it by his personal will, then there can be no revelation in the sense of Jews and Christians. God and the world are one in the other: everything moves in the same order, standing fast, once for all, in an eternal circle which ever returns into itself.

Celsus stands here at the height of his polemic against Christianity, as the champion of a view in principle opposed to it. But he fails to maintain this lofty standpoint. The pantheistic view of the world being intimately associated in his mind also with the polytheism of the old religion, he could not escape the question whether the position of polytheism necessarily yielded the same judgment on Christianity as he had been led to form from the standpoint of pantheism. If it cannot be allowed to Christianity that the one supreme God descended to the earth, yet it may be that, in the founder of it, one of those higher superhuman beings appeared, whose existence was taken for granted by Christians, Jews, and heathens equally, although under different names—Jews and Christians calling them angels, and the heathens demons. In this view all the arguments as yet brought against Christianity would fail to prove that it was not of higher divine origin. This is the point at which Celsus stands (v. 2), when he says to the Jews and Christians that neither God nor God's Son had come or would come down to the world; but if they mean angels, they ought to say what they understand under that name, whether gods, or beings of another kind, demons. This, then, we should expect to be the further question now to be discussed; but it is strange that Celsus makes no attempt at a direct answer to the question, but, as if he felt it necessary to concede the possibility that Christianity might

be a divine revelation in this sense, leaves that subject and turns to the contents of the religion of the Jews and Christians, attacking them now on this point, now on that. Especially does he seek to gain advantage over them by contrasting their system with the Greek philosophy and religion. Scarcely have angels been mentioned, when he wonders that the Jews, although they worship heaven and the angels in it, pay no homage to the most exalted and most powerful beings, the sun, moon, and stars.¹ He comes directly after this to the doctrine of the resurrection. That, he says, is a foolish view, that after God had lighted a fire, like a cook, all should be roasted in it, but that they alone should remain unharmed, and even those who were long dead arise with their flesh out of the earth. Worms might hope for that, but what soul of man could desire a corrupted body? Even among the Christians there are some who declare this to be an abominable and impossible notion, and how could a body that has been entirely destroyed be restored to its original nature? Not knowing what to answer to this question they take refuge in the most absurd assertion that to God all things are possible. But the unbecoming is not possible to God, nor does he will what is repugnant to nature; God is the reason of all that is, and can do nothing against reason, nothing against himself.² He concedes to the Jews, as he goes on, that they have the same right to their own national legislation as other nations have to theirs, but the Christians he says are deserters from the Jews, and the Jews should by all means give up thinking that they with their laws are wiser and better than others.³ As if he were only now arriving at his true theme, he goes on to concede to the Christians that their teacher is actually an angel, but insists upon it that he did not come first or alone, but that others came before him, as those also maintain, who

¹ v. 6.

² v. 14. It is curious to find so early as this the well-known distinction of *contra* and *supra naturam*. God wills nothing *παρὰ φύσιν*, Celsus says. Origen rejoins, cap. 23, that a distinction must be made; if *τὰ κατὰ λόγον Θεοῦ καὶ βούλησιν αὐτοῦ γινόμενα* are not necessarily *παρὰ φύσιν*, then we must say that *πρὸς τὴν κοινοτέραν νοουμένην φύσιν ἐστὶ τινα ὑπὲρ τὴν φύσιν, ἃ ποιῆσαι ἄν ποτε Θεός*.

³ v. 25, 33, 41.

suppose a higher God and father, distinct from the Creator of the world.¹ What this is intended to convey, and what the point of polemic is in this passage, is not quite clear, at least in Origen's account of it. But this is far from being the case in the further contents of the work, where he passes on to a comparison of Christianity with the Greek and especially the Platonic philosophy, and seeks to show that even if Christianity contains some elements that might prepossess a man of understanding in its favour, it has no monopoly of these, that these things are common property, and have been said far better by the Greeks before, and without those threats and promises about God or a Son of God.² Celsus appealed to expressions of Platonism, and extolled Plato highly that he did not promulgate his doctrines as supernatural revelations, nor close the mouth of any one who wished to inquire into the truth of them for himself. He made no demand that one should first of all believe; he did not say: God is so, or so; he has such a Son, and he himself has come down into the world and has spoken with me. On every point, even when the subject of investigation does not admit of further explanation, Plato brings forward reasonable arguments; he does not pretend to be the discoverer of something new, or to have come from heaven to reveal it, but says where he got it. When some of the Christians appeal to this authority and some to that, and all alike insist, "Believe if you wish to be saved, or else go your way," what are those to do who are in earnest in wishing to be saved? are they to appeal to the dice for a decision in what direction they shall turn, and to whom they shall attend?³ Plato has here, of course, a great superiority, and Celsus also seeks to prove in detail that the Christians borrowed a great deal from Plato, only that they misunderstood and disfigured what was thus taken. In general, the most godless errors of the Christians proceed from their inability to understand the divine mysteries. Under this category Celsus reckons more particularly the Christian doctrine of Satan,

¹ v. 52.

² vi. 1 sq.

³ vi. 8, 10. Comp. i. 9, where Celsus also brings against the Christians the reproach of ἀλόγως πιστεύειν.

the adversary of God. Even the ancients, Pherecydes, Heraclitus, and others, spoke enigmatically of a war of the gods. The Christians perverted this, and made out of it their doctrine of Satan. The Son of God is overcome by Satan, and warns the Christians of the Satan yet to come, who will accomplish great and wonderful things, and arrogate to himself the honour of God, telling them that they are not to be shaken in their faith when he appears. All this, Celsus says, shows simply that this Satan is a sorcerer or deceiver, like Jesus himself, and naturally enough is afraid of the latter as his rival.¹ The reason, Celsus goes on, why the Christians speak of a Son of God, is that the ancients called the world a child of God, as deriving its existence from God.² This leads him to speak of the world and the creation of the world, and of the Mosaic history of creation. In criticising this history he contrasts with the gross anthropomorphisms which he finds to denounce in it his Platonic doctrine of God: that God, as the cause of all existence, is without colour, form, or motion, and exalted above every word and conception. Here he notices an appeal which may be taken from this view. With regard to this notion of God and the question connected with it as to the possibility of knowledge of God, the Christians, he says, may argue, that just because God is so great, and it is so hard to know him, he implanted his Spirit in a body like our own, and sent him to us that we might hear him and learn from him. This, however, only provides Celsus with an opportunity, which he is not slow to use, to cover with derision so sensuous a representation. If God wanted to send his Spirit out from himself, how did he find it necessary to breathe it into the body of a woman? He knew how to make men, and could surely have formed a body for his Spirit without casting it into such filth. If he had appeared in this way coming down suddenly from above, no unbelief would have been possible. But if the divine Spirit was to be in a body, he ought to have surpassed all others in greatness, beauty, and the imposing effect of his whole presence. As it was, he was entirely undis-

¹ vi. 42 *sq.*² vi. 47 *sq.*

tinguished; in fact he was small and ugly. If God like Zeus in the comedy, awaking out of long sleep, formed a desire to deliver the human race from its evils, why did he send what the Christians call his Spirit into a corner; he ought to have animated many such bodies and sent them into the whole world. The comedy-writer, to excite laughter in the theatre, made Zeus, when he awoke from his sleep, send Hermes to the Athenians and Lacedaemonians; but it is much more ridiculous that God should send his Son to the Jews.¹ Celsus then reviews the prophecies of the Old Testament, and makes a number of objections to them. His most serious attack on them, however, consists of an argument suggested by the Gnostic antithesis of the Old and the New Testament. If the divine prophets of the Jews prophesied of Jesus as the Son of God, how can God, speaking through Moses, give the command to accumulate riches, to rule, to replenish the earth, to put enemies to death, to extirpate whole populations, as God himself did under the eyes of the Jews, while his Son, the Nazarene, gives commands exactly opposite to these, closes the access to the Father against the rich, the ambitious, and those who are striving after wisdom and honour, bids men care for food less than the ravens, for clothing less than the lilies, and requires that a man should turn the other cheek to the smiter? Who is lying then, Moses or Jesus; or had the Father, when he sent Jesus, forgotten the commands which he had given through Moses; or had he repented of his own laws, and did he send another messenger with contrary directions?² Celsus now puts the question to the Christians, Whither they are going, and what hope they have? As he interprets the doctrine of the resurrection as if the Christians expected to attain in this way to God and to the knowledge of God, this leads him back to the question of the knowableness of God. The Christians, Celsus says, ask again and again, how they are to know and see

¹ vi. 69 *sq.*

² vii. 18. Comp. vi. 29, where Celsus accuses the Christians of the inconsistency, that when they are pressed by the Jews they profess to have the same God as they, but when their teacher Jesus sets up a law quite different from that of the Moses of the Jews, they say they have a different God.

God, if there is no mode of knowing him by the senses; what, they say, can be known, except by the perception of the senses? But, says Celsus, it is not the man that asks this, not the soul, but only the flesh. If the cowardly body-loving generation¹ will hear anything, it is necessary to say to it that on these terms only will they see God, that they close their senses and look up with their spirit, that they turn away from the eye of the flesh and open that of the soul. And if they want a leader for this way they should eschew sorcerers and deceivers and those who recommend idols. If they do not do this, they make themselves in every way ridiculous; on the one hand, they blaspheme the approved gods as idols; on the other hand, they worship a god who is in fact more miserable than the very idols, not even an idol, but a dead man, and seek for a father like him. Celsus holds up to them the Platonic dictum about the Creator and Father of the universe, that it is hard to find him, and when one has found him, impossible to express him for all. That is the true way on which divine men seek the truth; a way indeed on which they, with that disposition of theirs, altogether entangled in the flesh, and seeing nothing pure, cannot follow. If they believe that a spirit has come down from God to proclaim the truth, this can be none other than that spirit who reveals those things with which men of the old time, such as Plato, were filled. If they cannot understand these things they should hold their peace and conceal their ignorance, and not call those blind who see, those lame who walk, when they themselves are quite lame and cripple in soul, and live only with their dead body.² If, from their love of innovation, they must have some one to adhere to, they should have chosen one who died a noble death, and was worthy of a divine mythos. If Herakles or Asklepios did not please them they might have had Orpheus, who also died a violent death, or Anaxarchus, or Epictetus, of whom sayings were reported such as to fit them

¹ Δείλον καὶ φιλοσώματον γένος, vii. 36, which accordingly can only represent God to itself as if he were by nature a σῶμα, and an ἀνθρωποειδὲς σῶμα, vii. 27.

² vii. 28, 36, 42, 45.

for the position. Instead of this they make a god out of one who closed the most infamous life with the most shameful death. Jonah in the belly of the whale, or Daniel in the den of lions, would have suited better.¹

Such were the attacks of an opponent whose skill in dialectical argument and sophism was equal to his talent for sarcasm and ridicule. But after all, there was still one point on which it was necessary for Celsus to come to a clear understanding as to his relations to the Christians, namely, the doctrine of demons. Here there appeared to be a common ground of meeting between Christians and heathens. We have already noticed the connection in which Celsus was led to this point in his polemical demonstration, but we saw that he only glanced at the subject and turned away. And it is hard to understand the reason for such deadly hatred against the Christians in an opponent to whom it ought to have been an easy matter to concede to Christianity a divine origin, if not in the Christian sense, yet in the sense of the pagan doctrine of demons. This, then, is a point which must be set forth more clearly, and so we cannot think it fortuitous that, at the close of his work, Celsus takes up the doctrine of demons for special discussion. The transition to the subject is made in this way. Celsus could not leave unproved the antipathy of the Christians to temples, altars, and images. The Christians, he says, simply reject images of the gods. If their reason for this is that an image of stone, wood, brass, or gold cannot be a god, this is a ridiculous wisdom: none but a fool holds them to be anything more than mere votive offerings and images. But if they think that there should be no images of the gods, because the gods have another form, the Christians should be the last to say this, for they believe that God made man after his own image, and that man is like him. Their reason then must be that they hold those to whom the images are dedicated to be, not gods, but demons, and are of opinion that a worshipper of God is not at liberty to serve demons. It is clear that they worship neither a god nor a demon, but a

¹ vii. 53.

dead man. But why should demons not be worshipped? Does not everything proceed from divine providence? does not everything that is done, whether by a god or by angels, or by other demons or by heroes, derive its law from the supreme God? Is not each one placed over that, the power of which has been given to him? Thus, according to the assertion of the Christians, he who worships God does not do right in worshipping one who has received his power from God, for it is not possible, as they say, to serve more masters than one.¹ This latter is accordingly the proposition which we have to deal with in considering the doctrine of demons, and their attitude with regard to which will necessarily show whether it is possible for Christians and heathens to come to an understanding on the subject of demons, or not. One would think, indeed, that this question was prejudged by the fact that the Christians connect a totally different notion with demons from that of the heathens, and will not have them considered to be divine beings at all. From the standpoint of the Christians, however, this view of demons is only a secondary view, a deduction; the reason why they are no true Gods is that, in the Christian view in general, nothing divine can be recognised beside the one God. This, accordingly, is the main proposition to be considered, and Celsus expresses it in the evangelical dictum, that no man can serve two masters. Proceeding from this point, he contests the Christian view of demons. The above assertion, he says, can only be set up by those who make a principle of sedition and discord, and who separate and break themselves away from the rest of mankind. He who speaks thus imputes to God his own affections. With men it might very naturally be the case, if the servant of one served another as well, that the former might feel his rights encroached on. But nothing of the sort can be the case with God, and he who worships a number of gods honours the supreme God by honouring those who belong to him.² It is impious, Celsus says, to speak of God as the one Lord; this supposes that there is an adversary, and can only bring division and disunion into the kingdom of God. Only then

¹ vii. 68.² viii. 2.

might the Christians perhaps maintain their proposition, if they worshipped no other but the one God, but they pay extravagant honour to one who only appeared lately, and they think that, notwithstanding the worship they pay to his servant, they do not come short of their duty to God. And the fact that the Christians worship God's Son as well as God amounts in itself to a concession that not only the one God is a proper object of worship, but his servants as well. So eager are they for the worship of the founder of their sect, and of him alone, that even if it were proved to them that he was not the Son of God, they would not worship the true God, the Father of all, without him.¹ That the Christians, if they believed the demons to be no gods, should refrain from taking part in public worship, in sacrifices and sacrificial feasts, was very natural, and what Celsus says against them on this head has no further significance. But all the more striking is the claim he makes to have reduced the Christians to the dilemma, that either they must worship the demons, or, giving up the worship of the demons, must renounce all further claim to live. If the Christians shrink from feasting with the demons, one can only wonder how they do not know that on these terms also they are table-companions with the demons, even though there is no slaughtered victim before them. The grain that they eat, the wine that they drink, the fruits they partake of, even the water and the air they breathe, all these things do they receive from the particular demons, to whom, each in his province, the care of every single thing is committed. Either, then, a man must not live at all, and cease to tread this earth, or, if one goes into this life, one must be thankful to the demons who are appointed as overseers over the earth, and bring to them first-fruits and prayers, as long as one lives, that they may continue to be kind to men.² Again and again does Celsus set before the Christians the two alternatives: the first that, if they refuse to pay to the guardians of all the honour that is due to them, then they should not live the life of men, should not marry wives nor beget children, nor do any of the other things customary

¹ viii. 11 sq.

² viii. 28.

in this life, but go away altogether without leaving a seed behind them, in order that such a race may die quite out of the world; the second, that if they marry wives, beget children, enjoy the fruits of the earth, take their share of what life affords, and put up also with the evils that are laid upon them (for nature itself so arranges it that all men have evils to endure; there must be evils as well as good things), then they should also pay to the overseers who are set over these things the honour that is due to them, and fulfil the common duties of life until they are released from their bonds, so as not to appear unthankful towards them. For it is unfair to enjoy what those powers have, without paying them some tribute for it.¹ The Christians did not wish to be ungrateful for daily benefits, as Celsus represented, only they believed their thanks were due, not to demons, but to angels. We also assert, Origen says, that without the presidency of invisible farmers and stewards, not only can the earth not bring forth her fruits, but also that no water can flow in springs and rivers; and that the air cannot without them be kept pure and healthy; but we do not say that the powers who exercise this invisible influence are demons. We know that angels are placed over the fruits of the earth and the beginning of the lives of animals; we praise and extol them as those to whom God has committed what is useful for our race; but we do not pay to them the honour which is due to God.² To so narrow a point is the polemic between Christianity and paganism here reduced. If only the Christians could have made up their minds to call their angels demons, and to consider them in that light, this would at once have removed one great cause of offence which the heathens found in Christianity, and they would have been much more inclined to make admissions to Christianity on points which the existence of this point of variance made them still contest. But how could Christianity ever make even this one concession without renouncing itself? Had the Christians worshipped those same beings, whom they called angels, as demons in the sense of the heathens, they would have been assenting to

¹ viii. 55.² viii. 31, 57.

heathen polytheism, and taking up a position identifying themselves with the whole mode of view peculiar to the heathen world. The opposition of the Christians to the heathen doctrine of demons is thus simply the point where the profound inner antithesis in which Christianity stands towards heathenism comes out most strikingly into visible form. Their denial of the heathen doctrine of demons was to the Christians the renunciation of the whole heathen view of the world, of that way of thinking which as often as it prevails does away with the absolute notion of the divine, because it does not uphold a strict enough distinction between the divine and the natural, but lets them flow together in one and the same conception, and so become indistinguishable. Thus, slight as the difference might appear to be between the angels of the Christians and the demons of the heathens, yet the antithesis which underlies it is as deep as possible. It is striking to notice how, in that part of his work in which he deals with the doctrine of demons, Celsus plays the part not so much of the assailant of Christianity as of the apologist of heathenism. As if he felt it to be of the utmost importance to convince the Christians here at least of the truth of the heathen religion, he cannot urge upon them too earnestly, how, by denying the heathen doctrine of demons, they deny their inmost consciousness of God, violate the most sacred duties, and show themselves to be men who do not deserve to live in the world at all. Must not the denial of the heathen doctrine of demons have appeared to Celsus to amount ultimately to an open declaration of war against the whole of heathenism, the most outspoken revolt against all that the whole heathen world counted as faith, and as holy usage handed down from the most ancient times? Thus it is very significant that just in this connection he accuses the Christians of a *στάσις*.¹ As rioters and revolvers have

¹ viii. 2. Here Origen says of Celsus.—*ἡμᾶς εἰσάγει λέγοντας πρὸς τὴν ἐπαπό-
ρησιν αὐτοῦ θέλοντος ἡμᾶς καὶ τοὺς δαίμονας θεραπεύειν, ὅτι οὐχ οἷόν τε δουλεῖν
τὸν αὐτὸν πλείοσι κυρίοις. Τοῦτο δ' ὡς οἶται στάσεως εἶναι φωνήν, τῶν ὡς αὐτὸς
ὠνόμασεν ἀποτεριζόντων ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἀπορρήγνυντων ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων.*
In another passage also Celsus characterises Christianity as a *στάσις*; Christ
is *στάσεως ἀρχηγέτης*, viii. 14.

they risen against the whole of the rest of human society, and renounced allegiance to it.¹ In this, however, they have done nothing but what was done by the Jews their ancestors, from whom they again have separated themselves. What gave rise to the Jewish people was simply that in consequence of a *στάσις* they separated themselves from the Egyptians to whom they originally belonged.² Sedition, division, sectarianism is thus the character which Judaism and Christianity have in common. All that drew down upon the Jews the hatred of the heathens, on account, as Tacitus says,³ of their *contrarii ceteris mortalibus ritus*, applied to the Christians, only in a much greater degree; inasmuch as their *στάσις* was a new and a very much worse one superadded to the old. With a Celsus indeed the natural antipathy of the heathens to the Jews had so far been softened, as to allow of his placing them on the same line with the other nations, and wishing their religion, whatever its nature might be, to be recognised as a national cultus.⁴ The reason for this was obviously that a people with such a national history as that of the Jews had a historical justification for itself which no one could deny: but what a distant prospect was it then to the time when the Christians should be able to claim a similar historical prescription? Till Christianity had at last succeeded in achieving such an existence, the Christians could only be regarded as raisers of sedition and deserters, as those who had fallen away as heretics from the Catholic body of mankind. As it was impossible to explain how, with such an origin, Christianity had yet obtained such importance as it was necessary

¹ Indeed they have gone so far as to conspire against society. That the Christians had no altars, images, or temples, was held to be *πιστὸν ἀφανοῦς καὶ ἀπορρήτῳ κοινωνίας σύνθημα*, to be done in accordance with a secret agreement. viii. 17; comp. i. 1.

² Compare iii. 4 sq.; iv. 31; ii. 1. According to Celsus' view dissent is so essentially a part of the character of the Christians, that he says, iii. 9, if all men were willing to become Christians, they themselves would be unwilling that it should be so.

³ Hist. v. 4. For, *profana illic omnia, quae apud nos sacra, rursum concessa apud illos, quae nobis incesta.*

⁴ Orig. *op. cit.* v. 25.

even then to concede to it, men were driven to assert that the lowest acts of deceit and craft had been the means through which Christianity had been introduced into the world.

Thus, although Christianity is no longer an *exitiabilis superstitio*, infamous on account of its flagitia,¹ yet its nature is simply deceit and delusion. But who is the originator of this deceit? Where there are deceivers there must be also deceived. There is no doubt that in the great mass of the Christians, Celsus saw simply the victims of deceit. According to the mean opinion which he had of the Christians, as uncultivated people, belonging to the lower orders, easily moved to materialistic expectations, they formed exactly the soil in which a great and far-reaching delusion might spread. Now on inquiring as to the source of this deception only two alternatives are possible: Was Jesus himself the originator of it, or is it to be charged only on his disciples? Celsus declared the disciples of Jesus to be deceivers of the worst sort, as in fact he saw in the whole society of the adherents of Jesus after his death a band of sorcerers who in all probability intended and arranged to spread abroad in the world the lie that Jesus had risen from the dead.² The narratives of the Gospel history Celsus considered to be for the most part the inventions of the evangelists, who had not even the skill to veil their fiction under an appearance of likelihood. Like those who in a drunken fit lay hands upon themselves, they changed the original copy of the Gospels three or four times, or even oftener, in order to deny what had been proved to be untrue in them. Especially are such narratives as that of the birth and the baptism of Jesus declared by Celsus to be devoid of all credibility. Who, he says, saw such a phenomenon as that at the baptism, or heard such a voice from heaven? who but those

¹ It is remarkable that there is no mention in the work of Celsus of all those injurious accusations which even Tertullian refuted in such detail. Celsus knew Christianity too accurately, and was too much in earnest, to pay heed to such charges. This is clearly indicated by Origen, vi. 27, 40. Compare also Eusebius E. H. iv. 7, where it is said expressly that in a short time those rumours completely died away.

² ii. 55.

whose interests led them to put forward such statements? It is also a mere invention of the disciples that Jesus foresaw and foretold all that was to happen to him.¹ But the disciples are not the sole originators of the delusion by which Christianity was introduced into the world, the charge necessarily falls on Jesus himself as well. If it was not till after the death of Jesus that the disciples fell away from the law of their fathers and founded a new sect, yet they were induced to do so by Jesus himself, who ridiculously misled them.² The first deception proceeded from Jesus, and when Celsus represents him as having learned in Egypt those magic arts through which he afterwards drew attention to himself in his own country, he can have seen nothing but one great work of deception in Jesus' whole activity.³ This more than anything else is characteristic of the attack which Celsus made on Christianity, that, refusing to recognise in it anything great and fitted to awaken reverence, he made Jesus himself a deceiver,⁴ and was unable, as it appears, to find any other account of Christianity than that it owed all its growth and its successes simply to fraud and deception.

And yet we can scarcely fail to see, that the deep contempt with which Celsus looks down upon Christianity, and the bitter mockery with which he overwhelms it in such abundant measure, are in fact feigned, and not the true expression of the writer's mind. Can there be any greater testimony to the importance which Christianity had by this time obtained in the eyes of the public of thinking men, than just the fact that a man like Celsus, undoubtedly one of the most cultivated and enlightened, the best-informed and most competent to judge, of those living in that age,

¹ ii. 26 sq.; i. 40; ii. 13.

² ii. 1.

³ Celsus allows the miracles of Jesus, but places them in the same class with those of the sorcerers, and of the things accomplished by those who having learned from the Egyptians for a few obols practised their lofty arts in the middle of the market, drove out demons, blew away diseases, called up the souls of heroes, displayed well-covered tables, and caused things without life to move as if alive, i. 68.

⁴ Celsus characterises Jesus as a deceiver throughout. In addition to the passages cited above see also ii. 49; vi. 42.

thought the new phenomenon of such importance as to make it the subject of a most careful and elaborate investigation? However much he found in it that was objectionable and worthless, absurd and meaningless, sensuous and materialistic; though he could not attribute any distinctive value to it as a whole, either in a philosophical or in a religious point of view; yet, to combat it successfully, he felt himself compelled to resort to every means that Greek philosophy offered, and to take up in opposition to it no less lofty a position than that of a Platonic philosopher. And if the main point of the controversy came to this, that the Christians refused to worship the demons, and would hear nothing of the popular mythical religion, how could he put so much earnestness into the accusation which he brought against them, when to himself, with his philosophical views, belief in the old gods could not possibly be anything more than a tradition which had become more or less detached from his consciousness? In spite of this, it is true, his standpoint prevented him from seeing in Christianity anything but a work of deception; but it is something that by this time it had come to be held for nothing worse; and we may take it as a proof of the great importance which attached to it in the mind of the age, that people should think there was no explanation but that of imputing to deception a phenomenon which, the greater its influence was, appeared the more enigmatical. What is this but saying that it had come to be a power in the world by a secret and mysterious road of which no further explanation could be given?

Whether or not the Celsus with whom we are acquainted from the work of Origen was the Celsus who was a friend of Lucian, at any rate Lucian may be placed by the side of Celsus in this respect, that from his works also we are able to form a more definite conception how Christianity was reflected in the heathen consciousness of that age, and assimilated that consciousness to itself more and more, losing by degrees the abrupt and repellent aspect under which it had hitherto been regarded in that quarter. Lucian, too, had a certain interest in Christianity; he knew, if not

perhaps the writings of the Christians, yet the principal facts of the gospel history, and the manners and customs of the Christians, and had formed an opinion of his own on the general character of Christianity.¹ His standpoint, however, was an entirely different one from that of Celsus. In spite of all the mockery and derision with which he treated Christianity, Celsus took up with all seriousness the task of refuting it, and as a Platonist did what he could to maintain the heathen view of the world against the opposite Christian view. An Epicurean, on the contrary, to whom the heathen belief in the gods had come to be nothing more than a subject for his wit and pleasantry, could not possibly feel any such interest. He saw in Christianity merely a phenomenon which afforded new material for that satirical picture of his age which in many of his writings he aimed at setting forth. Celsus, when seeking to give a vivid notion of the deception in which he judged that Christianity had its origin, placed it on the same line with other phenomena in which fraud and deception played the principal part. With Lucian the main point of view from which to regard Christianity was its affinity with such phenomena of the time. Christianity was in his eyes simply one more of those aberrations, perversions, and delusions of which he beheld so many in the motley confusion of his age. Thus, what chiefly attracted him in Christianity and in the Christians was that side on which it tended towards eccentricity, and afforded him most readily a subject for satire. The work of Lucian which has here to be considered, treats of the history of the life and death of the Cynic philosopher, Peregrinus Proteus. Christianity is indeed one of the principal subjects of this work, but the plan is such that Christianity is only treated of in association with the phenomena of like nature with which Lucian wished to classify it. The view which is taken of Christianity gives special prominence to

¹ Compare my work, *Apollonius von Tyana und Christus*, Tub. 1832, p. 134 sq. In the *Drei Abhandlungen*, p. 130-137. See also A. Planck, *Lucian und das Christenthum*. Stud. und Krit. 1851, p. 826 sq., especially on Lucian's acquaintance with the writings of the Christians, p. 886 sq.

two features of it: the one, the credulity of the Christians in which is to be found a very simple explanation of the origin of their religion; the other, their fanaticism with regard to martyrdom.

After committing many disgraceful crimes, and being at last obliged to flee from his country on account of having strangled his father, Peregrinus Proteus comes to the Christians in Palestine. At first he learns the strange wisdom of the Christians, but soon he outstrips his teachers, the priests and scribes, to such an extent that they become as pupils compared with him. Hereupon he becomes a prophet, the president of their cultus and their assemblies, and combines everything in his own person. In this capacity he expounds their books and composes many books himself, till at last he is worshipped by them as a god, and considered as their legislator. The part which he is thus made to play is evidently intended to form a parody of the history of Jesus, and to show how easy it is among people like these to attain to the position of a sect-leader. Only one thing was beyond the reach of Peregrinus: as the Christian community was already in existence when he entered it, he could not raise himself to the same height as Jesus. For they still indeed continued to worship that great man who was nailed to the post in Galilee, because he had brought these new mysteries into existence. Lucian goes on with his account of the sojourn of Peregrinus among the Christians, and narrates that he was cast into prison for being a Christian. This fact, however, added greatly to his reputation, and only strengthened his appetite for adventure and notoriety. The Christians regarded his imprisonment as a great misfortune, and took a great deal of trouble to effect his release, or at least to alleviate his hardships. From the cities of Asia came embassies of Christian churches to support and comfort him, and Peregrinus obtained a great deal of money on account of his incarceration. The object of all this is to work out the character of the Christians, with which view Lucian lays particular emphasis on the great industry with which they work at anything that they have once come to regard as a public matter. As quickly as possible they give away

all that they have, for these poor people have a conviction that they are wholly immortal, with soul and body, and will live for ever. On this account they also despise death, and most of them give themselves up to it voluntarily. Then their first lawgiver persuaded them that they are all brothers among each other, if by joining Christianity they deny the heathen gods and worship that sophist who was nailed to the post, and live according to his laws. These characteristic features, however, as well as the others, are referred by Lucian to that main characteristic of the Christians, that their credulity makes them become far too easily the prey of a deceiver. As they desire to be brothers, they condemn all property alike, and hold it to be common to them; all such tenets being simply accepted by them without accounting to themselves for their faith. Thus, if a deceiver comes to them, a clever man, who knows how to manage things, in a short time he may become very rich, and then turn the simpletons into ridicule.¹ Thus Lucian, as well as Celsus, found the ultimate explanation of Christianity in a deception; only he took no further trouble to trace the source and nature of this deception, and made up his mind, though not without a measure of pity for them, to regard the Christians as rather deceived than deceivers.

The second point with which Lucian was particularly struck in the Christians was their eagerness for martyrdom. To this, however, he allowed no very great value, attributing it partly to fanatical exaggeration, partly to the idle affectation of people who wished to make a name for themselves and excite some sensation in the world. The great scene in which Peregrinus meets his end, by plunging himself into the flames of a pyre before the people assembled at Olympia, is doubtless a pure fiction,² and can only be

¹ De morte Peregrini, cap. 11-13.

² This fact is not vouched for by any writer before Lucian or independent of him. Comp. Planck, p. 834 *sq.*, 843. Gregorovius, *Geschichte des römischen Kaisers Hadrian und seiner Zeit*, 1851, p. 254 *sq.*, regards the narrative of Lucian as fact and genuine history, without so much as asking the question whether what we have before us here is not either entirely or in part a piece of genuine Lucianic fiction. How he can do this I fail to understand. It is in any case, of

intended as a caricature of certain phenomena of his time ; and in this connection nothing suggests itself to us more naturally than the martyrdoms of the Christians, scenes which were just at that time, during the persecutions under Marcus Aurelius, attracting public attention. What was the object of bringing him into such close connection with the Christians, unless to represent him as their disciple in this the principal incident of the adventures he goes through ? Even at the earlier period when he was taken prisoner among the Christians by the heathen magistrate, the circumstance is represented as having done much to strengthen for the rest of his life the tendency which he had to seek in adventures that notoriety which was ever his great object. On that occasion the governor of Syria judged that there was no necessity even for whipping him, and released him simply for this reason, that being a man of a philosophical turn of mind he did not wish to give him any opportunity to satisfy his idle love of notoriety. Here the reference to the Christian desire for martyrdom is so unmistakable that the subsequent scene, where what might have happened then does actually come to pass under much more striking circumstances, falls naturally under the same point of view. It is true that Peregrinus is represented as having left the Christians and Christianity and is described merely as a Cynic, but this does not prevent us from seeing in his death a reference to Christianity. Lucian's whole method of treatment points to the conclusion, that

course, a picture of the time, even though the main features of the story were not actually combined in the person of a particular individual. Gregorovius places Peregrinus Proteus beside the wizard Alexander of Abonoteichos and the Pythagorean saint Apollonius, as the third form representing that absolute derangement of the reason and boundless fantasticality which had a place amidst the chaotic dissolution of the elements of morality and religion in the period of the emperors. But in the case of Alexander of Abonoteichos also how much has evidently been added to the facts by Lucian's exaggerating and idealising treatment of the subject, as he wished to give a clear and telling picture both of the charlatanry of such a deceiver and of the incredible gullibility of the public by such acts. The mean opinion of the Christians which he held and expressed in the Peregrinus did not hinder him from speaking of them in his Alexander as infidels and atheists, and placing them on the same level with the Epicureans whom he so much esteemed.

day on which the Jewish Passover was slain. But if the 14th was only distinguished as the day of the death of Jesus, and if what was meant by Jesus dying as the Passover was that He finally and for ever removed the old, that had reached its fulfilment, by placing in its stead the new, that had now come into being, then there could be no need to retain the 14th as the standing anniversary of the death of Jesus. To the Christian festival-calendar the only possible fixed day was the Sunday of the resurrection. Thus, while for the Easterns the 14th was the day of a standing festival, and everything else had to be arranged with reference to that day, with the Westerns the days of these yearly festivals were fixed on the opposite principle: the day of the death depended on the day of the resurrection, and as the latter was always a Sunday, the former was always a Friday. Though the Roman custom more and more gained the upper hand, yet the difference continued to exist even in later times, and was in fact one of the causes of the Council of Nice, for even at that time there were several ecclesiastical provinces in the

ever fails to apprehend correctly the point at issue. In his second, thoroughly revised, edition of 1857, Lechler brings forward only what is quite familiar, and was refuted long ago. For the literature of the question cf. Steitz: *die Differenz der Occidentalen und der Kleinasiaten in der Passahfeier, auf's Neue kritisch untersucht und im Zusammenhang mit der gesamten Festordnung der alten Kirche entwickelt*, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1856, p. 721. Against this my Dissertation on the Johannine question in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, p. 242, *sq.*, and Hilgenfeld, p. 523, *sq.* In defence of his view or of Weitzel's hypothesis, Steitz gave certain further observations in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1857, p. 741, which I did not neglect to answer; see *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.*, 1858, p. 298, *sq.* The question has been so long the subject of investigations and so thoroughly discussed on both sides that two points may now be regarded as established results against which it is not likely that any new argument of importance will be adduced. These are—(1.) The Passover on the 14th was not consecrated to the Redeemer dying or already dead, but to the Lord now entering into his sufferings (his *πάθος*), and still sitting in the midst of his disciples. (It was this, as I pointed out when I last wrote on the subject, that filled these last moments with recollections of such infinite tenderness. Hence it was that for the Christians of Asia Minor, everything was wrapped up in that one day, and that they would know nothing of any consideration that would have detached them from the sentiment so intimately connected with that day. Everything was concentrated on the few hours of the Passover held after the fast in memory of Jesus' last supper. Far from being a festival of joy, the æsthetical antithesis to the fast just brought to a conclusion, as some think it must have been, it must have been kept in the solemn

East in which the Passover was kept at the time when the Jews kept it.¹ The Judaism of the Quartodecimans had given offence from the first; and the same anti-Jewish feeling still finds expression in the declaration of the Council of Nice, that it was improper to be guided by the custom of the unbelieving and hostile Jews. All the Christians of the East, who had hitherto been keeping the Passover with the Jews, were in future to celebrate it in conformity with the usage of the Roman Church. Indeed, so strong was the desire to have nothing in common with the Jews in this festival, that when the Easter full moon fell on a Sunday, Easter was to be celebrated not on the day of the full moon, but on the following Sunday.

So lively and universal was the commotion aroused by this question not only in Asia, but among the Christian Churches of the age in general. And this makes it impossible to disregard the attitude of the Gospel of John with regard to the dispute. It takes its stand most decidedly upon the side of the Western tradi-

mood appropriate to a supper of farewell, but a mood lifted above mere sorrow by the deepest sentiment of piety.) (2.) The pretended heretical Quartodecimans are utterly unvouched for by any historical evidence; in fact they are simply a makeshift of apologetics. In his "last words," in which he (Steitz) finally wound up his investigation into the Paschal controversy viewed aesthetically and otherwise (*der ästhetische Charakter der Eucharistie und des Fastens in der alten Kirche*, Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1859, p. 716 *sq.*), he sums up his result as follows, p. 737: "There is every reason not to set too high a value on the statements of Polycarp and Polycrates about John. The Church of Asia Minor will have received from the beloved disciple the fact attested by the fourth Gospel, that Christ died on the 14th of Nisan, and perhaps also the usage of celebrating this day as the standing anniversary of his death; but there is no doubt that the manner of celebration belongs to a later age, and was formed by a process of historical development, though probably upon the basis of the fourth Gospel (cf. xvi. 6, 7; xix. 30.)" This is a view of history dominated and limited by the "beloved disciple;" and it ends in simply denying the value of historical evidences, such as those of Polycarp and Polycrates, which do not suit the writer's purpose, while the question under discussion is no nearer a solution at the conclusion of the argument than it was at the beginning.

¹ Cf. Athanas. de Syn. 5, where there is special mention of οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Συρίας καὶ Κιλικίας, καὶ Μεσοποταμίας, as those who ἐχώλεον περὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν καὶ μετὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐποίουν τὸ πάσχα. Cf. Eusebius, de vita Const. iii. 5. 18. Socr., H. E., i. 9.

the general mode of view. In this respect nothing was to be hoped for from the side of Epicureanism, everything savouring of religion being indifferent to that system; and just as little could anything be expected from Stoicism, the Christian fanatical eagerness for death being so repugnant to that school that the Stoics despised Christianity as un-Roman. Platonism, however, little though it appeared prepared for such a concession in such a one as Celsus, was universal enough and broad enough at heart to concede to Christianity, just at that point at which this was of most importance, the divinity of its origin.

The way for this great change was prepared by that religious eclecticism and syncretism which, arising on the basis of the oriental cultus of the sun, became diffused in the Roman empire immediately after the age of the Antonines, and to which even some of the rulers of the empire were devoted with fanatical religiosity. The positive proof of the influence which this syncretism exercised on the view taken of Christianity by the heathen world is to be found in the life of Apollonius of Tyana, written by Philostratus,¹ a work which occupies an important position at this point of our history. It came into existence in the first decades of the third century, in the circle of the empress Julia Domna, the wife of the emperor Septimius Severus.² We can scarcely be wrong in imputing to that lady the same way of thinking on religious matters which subsequently appeared in such a marked manner in several members of the imperial house and of her family. The subject of the work is the magician Apollonius of Tyana, who is known to us also from other sources to have lived in the second half of the first century. He is said to have excited attention chiefly in the reign of Domitian as a prophet and a worker of miracles. There is very little heard of him elsewhere, but with Philostratus he appears in a highly idealised narrative, which compels us to look for some special motive. Looking at the features with which he is portrayed, we are left in little doubt as to the object which Philostratus had in view in the composition of his work. The somewhat ambiguous

¹ Comp. my work mentioned p. 168. ² *Vita Apoll.* i. 3. Comp. *Vita Soph.* ii. 30. 1.

personage of the magician and prophet is here transformed, in a word, into a moral and religious world-reformer, who, if he were actually historical, would have transcended all that the ancient world has to show in the way of such endeavours. The activity to which, according to this narrative, he devoted his whole life, has throughout a religious tendency. Wherever we see him appear it is his most earnest endeavour to diffuse a correct knowledge of the gods and of divine things, to teach the mode of worship pleasing to the gods, to awaken love for the divine, and the disposition to worship the gods in piety. Accordingly he everywhere preferred to discourse on religious subjects, and in his constant wanderings he passed by no sacred place which either could excite pious feelings by the memories connected with it, or was still made choice of by the gods and heroes for the revelation of their visible nearness and presence. He visited all the temples and loved to stay in them, and held discourses in them which produced such an effect that the gods were more zealously worshipped, and men flocked to the place, as if they expected to receive from the gods more abundant gifts. With the same earnestness did he insist on virtue and morality. Wherever he appeared he exercised his influence in a way deserving of the highest respect to bring back an enervated age to the severer and purer customs of antiquity, and so to lay a firmer foundation for the wellbeing of the states. Especially did he recommend the knowledge of self, and careful attention to the moral judgment which utters itself in the voice of conscience. The standard of moral judgment he placed in the idea of righteousness, but he declared expressly that to do no wrong could not be held equivalent to righteousness. With these doctrines and principles he sought to give to his activity the greatest possible extension and universality. He appeared everywhere, acting always in the same way, and his unintermitted wanderings through all the lands of the then known world could have no other purpose than to make the wisdom which he taught and the benefits he hoped to effect for the whole of mankind the common property of all. Thus his activity is in itself a testimony

to the universal character of his ideas. His doctrine, moreover, had nothing secret or particular in it; his discourses were public, and any one who wished it might be present at them. It is true that he had a smaller circle of disciples about himself, but he does not seem to have made any very radical distinction in respect to the instruction that he gave them. His notion with regard to the disciples whom he kept by his side was in general to secure by means of them the universal recognition and firm establishment in the future of those doctrines and principles by which he expected that a new impetus would be given to moral and religious life. It lay in the nature of the case that, as a moral and religious reformer, he should enter into a certain opposition to the world around him. The object of his activity was to correct, to the utmost of his power, the ignorance and indifference in divine things, the moral defects and infirmities, which prevailed among his contemporaries, and the various aberrations which he saw in individuals here and there, and thus, as he believed, to remove the disproportion in which the men of his age stood to the idea which he considered ought to be realised in human life. His work had however a political tendency as well as a religious, and this gave it a still more distinctive character. His public life falls in the period when the tyranny of Domitian was spreading terror through the Roman world. Apollonius opposed the tyranny with the courage of a sage whom no danger could daunt, and appeared as the champion of freedom, calling to his aid in that cause all the doctrines and principles that true philosophy can offer. Yet for a reformer of manners and religion, it is not enough that he should devote his public activity to the idea which inspires him; he must first of all bring it to view in a living and concrete form in his own person. And in the person of Apollonius, according to the picture drawn of him by Philostratus, such an ideal actually did appear. In this respect the following traits deserve special attention. Intellectually his higher knowledge raised him far above common men, and he in fact united in himself, as a common focus, all the knowledge of his time, both in

human and in divine things. So, in point of practice, he was an equally perfect sage. From his youth up he had devoted himself with inexpressible mysterious love to the Pythagorean philosophy, and he followed the mode of life which that philosophy prescribed to its votaries as alone holy, pleasing to God, and worthy of the wise man, more strictly than any one else. But the wise man made perfect cannot appear in his true greatness until he has overcome the terrors of death, and so this could not be wanting in the life of Apollonius. He did not put away from him the thought of giving himself up as a martyr to the cause of freedom, and by his intrepidity and his contempt for death he disarmed the cruelty of the tyrant Domitian. All these things combined—his extraordinary knowledge of divine and human things, the spotless purity which produced in him a visible representation of the fairest union of all the virtues, and the most undoubted ideal of moral perfection, the noble determination of his whole life to work for the good of mankind, the courage in the presence of death with which he defended the cause of freedom against tyranny, and in the consciousness of duty was resolved to offer up his life,—all this made him appear to be divine and more than human. The divine element in his nature attested itself in his gift of prophecy and miracle; and, in addition to this, the miraculous occurrences which attended both his birth and the end of his life, cast a peculiar glory on his person. Thus it appears no more than natural when we find that even his contemporaries regarded him as a god.

When, however, we consider, on the one hand, how unhistorical and how idealised the whole picture is, so that we cannot help thinking that it was drawn up with some particular intention; and on the other hand, what a striking agreement there is in all the main features of the ideal between Apollonius and Christ, and how in many of his details Philostratus betrays a familiar acquaintance with the history of the Gospels, we are driven to ask what intention this companion picture was meant to serve. There is nothing to point to a purely hostile tendency. If what

Philostratus meant by his picture was simply that the Christians had no reason to think their Christ so extraordinary and unique a phenomenon, and that the heathen world was able to confront their ideal with another not unlike it, even this might certainly be regarded as an opposition to Christianity. But we have to consider, first of all, how great a concession is made in the mere fact that the ideal thus set up is nothing but a counterpart to the original which is to be found in Christianity. Looking back to Lucian and Celsus, where do we find the faintest recognition of such a superiority in Christianity? As if every prejudice against it were now overcome, not only is there a concession that Christianity possesses something exalted and divine, but the contention is simply that the distinction is not peculiar to Christianity; and all that the heathen world can furnish to make up a companion picture is called into requisition. The philosophy which is attributed to Apollonius declares itself to be Pythagorean; and there can be no doubt that the favour which Pythagoreanism began to enjoy, even at the beginning of the Christian era, and its growing reputation since then, furnish the chief part of the explanation of the great change of the mind and feelings of the heathen world with regard to Christianity. In the work of Philostratus, studiously as it avoids every hint as to its relation to Christianity, that change stands before us as an accomplished fact. As philosophy began itself to take a religious direction, and sought to appease that yearning after a higher revelation which the negativity of the results reached up to this time had produced in her, from the traditions of antiquity and the doctrines of the religions of the East,¹ it could not but grow more inclined to believe in a doctrine which came forward with a claim to be a divine revelation, and which, having already existed for two hundred years, could not be regarded as a new thing, as a mere growth of yesterday. In this way there proceeded out of Neo-Pythagoreanism particularly that syncretism which held that the way to approach most nearly to absolute truth was to unite as far as possible in one view the different forms of

¹ Comp. Zeller, *die Philosophie der Griechen*, vol. iii. p. 490 sq.

religion, so far as any higher divine element appeared to be revealed in them, then letting them all stand side by side with the same relative claim to truth, and regarding them all alike as rays from one and the same principle of light. Thus Christianity also took its proper place by the side of the other religions. Honour was paid to its founder as to the founders of other religious institutions, and other wise men of antiquity were placed beside him. It was held to be quite fitting to confront with what was recognised as high and divine in Christianity other systems with equal claims, or, as some might think, even higher and more perfect, found in the heathen world; it being quite forgotten in the meantime that Christianity itself must claim quite a different relation from this to heathen religion and philosophy. But when Platonism, which from the very beginning stood in so close a relation to Pythagoreanism, had gained a more systematic development in its new form, and had risen to be the ruling philosophy of the age, it could not but feel the necessity of coming to some more distinct understanding with Christianity, and of defining more exactly both what elements of the latter it approved and recognised, and what it was obliged to regard as an opposition in principle. In Celsus we saw the outspoken assailant, in Philostratus the doubtful syncretistic mediator. We are now brought to the Neo-Platonist, *Porphyrius*, the chief representative of the third and only remaining possible form of the intellectual process here running its course—a form in which we see the religious consciousness of the heathen world as powerfully attracted by Christianity on the one side as repelled by it on the other.

Although Porphyrius has to be considered under both of these aspects, yet he is the writer whom the Fathers of the Church regarded as the bitterest and most irreconcilable opponent of Christianity.¹ His work against the Christians, written in fifteen books, was a still more celebrated attack than that of Celsus, and so much were the Christians alive to its importance, that the most

¹ 'Ο ἀσπονδος ἡμῶν πολέμιος, ὁ πάντων ἡμῶν ἔχθιστος, he is called, e.g. by Theodoret. Gr. affect. cur. disp. 10. 12. Ed. Schulz, vol. iv. pp. 954, 1040.

distinguished Doctors of the Church at that time composed detailed and elaborate replies to it. This was done by Methodius of Tyre, by Eusebius of Cæsarea, and by Apollinaris of Laodicea. The attack of Porphyrius on Christianity was not so comprehensive and manysided, nor was it in the same degree directed against the whole Christian view of the world, as that of Celsus; but the better was he able to fix upon those points with regard to which no exception could be taken to the cogency of the facts on which his arguments insisted. The replies have been lost, as well as the work itself, and we have but a very limited acquaintance with the work, which the Christians overwhelmed with their hatred; but this is the impression which we gain from the few fragments of it which have been preserved to us. Porphyrius attacked chiefly the writings of the Christians, and directed his critical acuteness to prove contradictions in them, which seemed at once to do away with the reputation of being divine which those works enjoyed. As an example of this he fastened on the conflict of the two apostles, mentioned in Galatians ii., reproaching one apostle with his error, and the other with his contentiousness, and from the whole narrative drawing the conclusion that if the heads of the Church disagreed so violently with one another, their whole doctrine could only rest on invention and lies.¹ In the Gospel history itself he found fault with the conduct of Jesus, John vii. 8, compare with 14, which he said was ambiguous and inconsistent.² The 12th book of the work was specially famous. Here Porphyrius dealt with the predictions of the prophet Daniel, and tried to show that the Book of Daniel was not written by the prophet whose name it bears, but by a later writer who lived in Judea in the

¹ Comp. Hieronymus in the præmium of his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians.

² Hieron. dial. c. Pelag. ii. 17. He seems to have found in other parts of the Gospel history also much that was untrue and designedly falsified. Comp. Hier. Ep. 57 ad Pammach., c. 9; Quaest. hebr. in Gen., init. In the Acts he interpreted the words of Peter to Ananias and Sapphira, v. 4 *sq.*, not as a prophetic denunciation of a judgment of God, but as *imprecari mortem*. Jerome (in his Epist. ad Demetriadem, in Semler's edition of Pelag. Epist. ad Demetr. p. 156) cites this as a foolish saying of Porphyrius (*ut stultus Porphyrius calumniatur*).

time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Daniel, he said, did not predict the future, but this later writer narrated things that were past. All that he says up to the time of Antiochus contains true history, but what comes down past that date is untrue, as he did not know the future.¹ In his criticism of the Mosaic history and of Jewish antiquities, the subjects dealt with in his fourth book, he blames severely the Commentators, and particularly Origen, for their allegorising, by which they foist transcendent mysteries into the clear meaning of the Mosaic writings.² Especially characteristic of his method of attack are the three following dialectical questions: If Christ calls himself the way of salvation, grace, and truth, and causes the souls which believe in him to expect their return from him alone, what did men do during all the centuries before Christ? Why do the Christians reject sacrifices, if the God of the Old Testament instituted them? What relation is there between sin and eternal punishment, if Christ says, With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again?³

These objections show us how sharp the polemic of Porphyrius was; he doubtless brought forward many others like them, and in fact his whole style of argument, so far as we are acquainted with it, shows the spirit of a Celsus. Yet it was by no means his intention, as it was that of Celsus, to pronounce a purely negative judgment on Christianity. What he blamed and rejected in Christianity was placed to the account of that Christianity alone which even then was no longer the genuine and original religion. A way had now to be found to combine that respect and sympathy which Neo-Platonism could not withhold from Christianity, with the standpoint which heathenism had occupied in its opposition to Christianity, and was still to continue to occupy. The way chosen to gain this end was to distinguish the teacher from the

¹ Jerome in the *proem.* to his Commentary on the Prophet Daniel.

² Euseb. E. H. vi. 19. He said of the allegorising method of interpretation of these expositors of the Old Testament, that it so captivates the soul with its high-flying imagination as to deprive it of all sound judgment.

³ August. Ep. 102, or *Sex Quaest. contra Paganos expositae*; qu. 2, 3, 4. Comp. Jer. Ep. 133 ad Ctesiph., c. 9.

disciples. In place of a merely negative dialectic and polemic which sought to demonstrate the falseness and futility of Christianity as a whole, there now appeared a criticism which set itself to the task of distinguishing the original truth from the elements of untruth and falsehood which had gathered round it. Not that Christianity was even now to be absolved from the charge of deception: there was no way of accounting for the importance it had gained in the world except on this hypothesis; but the charge of deception did not now attach to the founder himself, it only extended to the sphere of those who came after him, who had disfigured his true doctrine and given to it these false adjuncts which could not but rouse the religious mind of the heathens in repulsion and abhorrence against it. The Neo-Platonists were the first to take up this position with regard to Christianity, which may with justice be called a position of criticism, inasmuch as it had the same tendency as that of every critical interpretation of Christianity in after times; it being the first task of such an interpretation to inquire what part of Christianity is the essential and original truth of it, and what has been added to it in other ways. They were those "*vani Christi laudatores et Christianae religionis obliqui obtrectatores*," who, as Augustine says,¹ "*continent blasphemias a Christo, et eas in discipulos ejus effundunt*." What Celsus charged upon Jesus himself is now laid at the door of his disciples only. It was only they who denied the heathen gods, and took up so hostile a relation to the popular heathen religion. Jesus himself was far from doing this; he believed in the gods, honoured them according to heathen custom, and performed by their aid in theurgical fashion those miracles by which he attained so great celebrity.² As the disciples said a thing about their

¹ *De Consensu Evangelistarum*, i. 15.

² The Neo-Platonists said of Jesus (Augustine, *op. cit.* c. 34): *Nihil sensisse contra Deos suos, sed eos potius magico ritu coluisse et discipulos ejus non solum de illo fuisse mentitos, dicendo illum Deum, per quem facta sunt omnia, cum aliud nihil quam homo fuerit, quamvis excellentissimae sapientiae, verum etiam de Diis eorum non hoc docuisse, quod ab illo didicissent*. They spoke also of writings composed by Christ, which contain "*eas artes quibus eum putant illa fecisse miracula, quorum fama ubique percrebuit*," *op. cit.* cap. 9.

Master in this particular of which he never thought himself, it was also a false statement on their part that he called himself God. To concede divine dignity to Jesus would have been giving Christianity too great an advantage over heathenism; but the Neo-Platonists were perfectly ready to recognise and honour him as one of the wisest and most distinguished of men.¹ Even this distinction, however, Jesus was made to share with the wise and godlike men of heathen antiquity, and the parallel was not meant to raise him but rather to cast him into the shade. With a like object to that which Philostratus had in view in writing his life of Apollonius, Porphyrius and Iamblichus wrote the life of Pythagoras, surrounding and glorifying it with all those elements which could give it the appearance of a theophany, such as the Christians thought they had in Christ. They studiously represented their divine Pythagoras not only as the highest ideal of wisdom, but as an incarnate God. Even as a youth, Iamblichus says,² he made the impression of a god. All who saw and heard him gazed upon him full of wonder, and many expressed a well-grounded conviction that he was the son of a god. But he, confidently relying on the opinion that was held about him, on the cultivation he had received from his childhood onwards, and on the natural godlikeness of his being, showed himself all the worthier of the advantages he possessed. He was distinguished by religiousness, by knowledge, by his peculiar mode of life, by the healthy constitution of his soul, by the grace of his body in every speech and action, by an inner cheerfulness and inimitable repose of soul which he suffered to be disturbed by no fit of anger or of laughter, of envy or contentiousness, or of any other passion. So he lived in Samos like a good demon who had appeared among men.³ When he entered Italy and founded

¹ Aug. *op. cit.* cap. 7. Honorandum enim tanquam sapientissimum virum putant, colendum autem tanquam Deum negant. The heathen oracles, on the deliverance of which the Neo-Platonists laid so great weight, are said to have declared Jesus to be one of the holiest and wisest of men. August. *de Civit. Dei*, 19. 23; Euseb. *Dem. ev.* iii. 8.

² *De Vita Pythagorica*, cap. 2.

³ ὥς δὲ δαίμων τις ἀγαθὸς ἐπιδημῶν τῇ Σαμῷ.

Magna Graecia, admired of all, here also he appeared as a god. The inhabitants received his laws and precepts as divine commands, from which not even the smallest deviation was permissible. In perfect concord did the whole community of his disciples live together, praised and counted happy by all who dwelt round about them. They had introduced community of goods in their society. Pythagoras they even now counted in the circle of the gods as a good demon, friendly to mankind. Some said he was the Pythian Apollo, others the Hyperborean; some that he was Paeon, others again that he was one of the demons that inhabit the moon, and others that he was one of the Olympian gods, who, for the welfare and the restoration of the life of mortals, had appeared in human form to those then alive, that he might impart to their mortal nature the saving light of blessedness and of philosophy (the philosophy which saves).¹ No greater benefit, Iamblichus adds, had ever been sent into the world than that given by the gods through this Pythagoras, nor would any greater come; and, therefore, the proverb even now speaks with the greatest reverence of him of the wreathed head from Samos. Thus, if there is such an incarnation of God as the Christians assert with regard to Christ, or such an *ἐπιδημία εἰς ἀνθρώπους Θεοῦ*, as the philosopher Eunapius proposed to call the life of Apollonius by Philostratus,³ and as the life of Pythagoras, as described by Porphyrius and Iamblichus, may also be called, yet Pythagoras stands alone, and Christ can only be regarded, in comparison with him, as a secondary phenomenon of the same kind. Thus it is a mere exaggeration on the part of the Christians that they should think to make more of their Christ than a god or a divine man in the sense of the heathens. But what Neo-Platonism had once recognised in Christ was no longer drawn into dispute. Even such a controversialist as Hierocles, the governor of Bithynia,

¹ *Εἰς ὠφέλειαν καὶ ἐπανόρθωσιν τοῦ θνητοῦ βίου ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῃ μορφῇ φανῆναι τοῖς τότε, ἵνα τὸ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας τε καὶ φιλοσοφίας σωτήριον ἔναυσμα χαρίσῃται τῇ θνητῇ φύσει.* Comp. Tit. ii. 11 sq.

² In the *Προοίμιον* to the *Vitæ Sophist.*, ed. Boissonade. Amsterdam, 1822, p. 3.

who, in imitation of the Ἀληθὺς λόγος of Celsus, wrote "Words of the love of truth" (λόγοι φιλαλήθεις)¹ in four books, against the Christians, raised no objections on this head. A parallel drawn between Christ and the glorified Apollonius of Philostratus appears to have formed the main feature of his work, and the only reproach he brings against the Christians is that they cannot judge more soberly and judiciously of extraordinary phenomena of this kind. The Christians pride themselves uncommonly on their Jesus, of whom they boast that he restored sight to certain blind people, and performed some other miracles of the same kind; but it is worthy of remark that the heathens hold a much more correct and reasonable view on such things, and the way in which they regard their remarkable men deserves consideration. He accordingly went on to speak of Aristeas of Proconnesus, of Pythagoras, and others of old times, dwelling most of all on the miracles of Apollonius of Tyana, who only appeared under the reign of Nero; and his purpose in speaking of all this, he said, was simply to contrast the accurate, and, in each separate case, well-founded judgment of the heathens with the thoughtlessness of the Christians. The heathens do not hold such a miracle-worker for a god, but only for a man beloved of the gods; the Christians, on the contrary, on account of a few insignificant wonders that he did, declare Jesus to be a god. And there is the further point to be considered that the works of Jesus were embellished in every way by Peter and Paul and some other lying and fantastical men like them, who also gave themselves up to sorcery, while the acts of Apollonius were described by men who stood at the highest stage of culture, and knew how to value truth, and who were led by benevolence to save the deeds of a noble man, whom the gods loved, from remaining in obscurity.² The most that the heathens could concede to Christ was a divine dignity in the sense in which, in general, the polytheistic view admits of different forms of the divine subsisting

¹ We know this work only from the reply of Eusebius of Cæsarea, *Contra Hieroclem*.

² Eusebius, *op. cit.* c. 2.

side by side. Thus the worship of Jesus presupposed the worship of the heathen gods as equally justified, and the controversy between heathens and Christians was thus always driven back to the question of the reality of the heathen gods. This the Christians could not grant without sacrificing the absoluteness of their notion of God; while the heathens, on the contrary, were unable to regard as the exclusive predicate of an individual, what they had been accustomed to consider as the common attribute of many. And as the Christians were still, as against the heathens, a mere sect, the origin of which was not yet very remote, they were liable to the reproach of having fallen away from the common faith of the people, which the tradition of antiquity made sacred, and to the eyes of the Neo-Platonist this was a much more serious imputation than it appeared to people in general. In the Neo-Platonist view of the world polytheism is something more than an expression of the beautiful many-sidedness of the world: it is an arrangement instituted by the ruler of the universe, and the reason of the existence of a number of different popular religions is simply that each people has its own demon as its national governor.¹ On this view, to desert the religion of one's country is an impious violation of the general world-order which God has set up, and in which he has assigned to every one his place. Thus Porphyrius said that the greatest fruit of piety was to honour the Deity according to the customs of one's country (*τιμᾶν τὸ θεῖον κατὰ τὰ πάτρια*),² and in a parallel between Ammonius Saccas and Origen,³ he pronounced the judgment that Ammonius, although born of Christian parents, yet turned, as soon as he began to philosophise, to the lawful method (*ἡ κατὰ νόμους πολιτεία*), while Origen, though a Greek, and brought up among Greeks, turned to "the barbarian im-

¹ On this compare Orig. c. Celsum, v. 25.

² In the letter to his wife Marcella, found by A. Mai, and published in the year 1816. Cap. 18.

³ Euseb. E. H. vi. 19. On the assertion of Porphyrius compare my notice of Heigl's Programme of the year 1835 in the Berlin Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik, 1837, 2d vol., p. 652 sq.; Redepennig, Origenes, 1841. 1st part, p. 422 sq.

puddence," corrupted his Greek learning, and lived as a Christian in a way contrary to the laws.

Thus Christianity, thrust aside at first with mere hatred and abhorrence, and declared at a later period to be nothing but deception and fanaticism, had now, by the syncretistic mediation of Neo-Platonism, arrived at a certain accommodation with the consciousness of the heathen world. So far had this process gone that the question which now came to the front in the conflict of these two spiritual powers, was merely the question of form, whether it was permissible to change from the religion which had hitherto prevailed to a new one. This was a question which a man could only answer according to the suggestions of his religious consciousness. He whose religious feelings could not dispense with such a view of the divine as the figures of the gods of the old religion offered, was compelled to answer the question in the negative; but it fell to be answered in the affirmative by every one on whose consciousness the old gods could no longer exercise the old demonic power. But even those whose inner life had become entirely loosed and delivered from all the bonds of the old faith might still feel themselves under an external obligation, by the fact that they stood as individuals, or as a very weak minority, against a greatly preponderating majority. Thus the main question at this time was substantially the same as that which afterwards attained so great importance within the Christian Church—how the subjective freedom and right of the individual is related to the power of custom and tradition, or to the authority of a tradition counted catholic. All those notions which gave the Christian Church its catholic character belonged to the old faith in the gods as well; and what right had the individual, if he could not feel himself free in his own consciousness, over against this power? It is worthy of notice how even the earliest Christian apologists, in defending the Christian faith against that of heathenism, are led to the assertion of the Protestant principle of freedom of faith and conscience as an original and essential attribute of the notion of religion. They press this on their heathen opponents: Whence, Tertullian says, is that right

derived, which every one exercises among the heathens, to worship principally this god or that? Whence but from religion itself, which, from its very nature, must be an affair of free choice, of free self-determination. Why should not the Christians have the same right?¹ The author of the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies discussed the same question. He makes the heathen grammarian Appion assert that it is the greatest sin to leave the observances of one's country and turn to barbarous customs; but in answering the question whether *παντῶς δεῖ φυλάσσειν τὰ πάτρια*, he sets up a distinction between *ἀλήθεια* and *συνήθεια*. To forbid the change from the heathen religion to the Christian, on the ground that it is wrong to fall away from the customs and the faith of one's fathers, is to ignore the great difference there is between truth and custom. Ancestral customs are to be maintained only if they are good, but the heathen religion is not good, for the simple reason that it is the worship of many gods.² The same reply is given by Origen to Celsus; we know that it is right to give up what has been customary from the beginning in the various countries, if there are better and more divine laws, such as those which Jesus as the mightiest has given; but it is wrong not to trust one's-self to him who has shown himself purer and mightier

¹ Apol. c. 24: Colat alius deum, alius Jovem, alius ad coelum supplices manus tendat, alius ad aram Fidei, alius, si hoc putatis, nubes numeret orans, alius lacunaria, alius suam animam deo suo voveat, alius hirci. Videte enim, ne et hoc ad irreligiositatis elogium concurrat, adimere libertatem religionis, et interdicere optionem divinitatis, ut non liceat mihi colere, quem velim, sed cogar colere, quem nolim. Nemo se ab invito coli volet, ne homo quidem. Atque adeo et Aegyptiis permissa est tam vanae superstitionis potestas—unicuique etiam provinciae et civitati suus deus est.—Sed nos soli arcemur a religionis proprietate. Laedimus Romanos, nec Romani habemur, quia non Romanorum deum colimus. Bene quod omnium deus est, cujus velimus aut nolumus omnes sumus. Sed apud vos quodvis colere jus est, praeter deum verum, quasi non hic magis omnium sit deus, cujus omnes sumus. Cp. Ad Scap. c. 2: Humani juris et naturalis potestatis et unicuique, quod putaverit colere, nec alii obest aut prodest alterius religio. Sed nec religionis est, cogere religionem, quae sponte suscipi debeat, non vi, cum et hostiae ab animo libenti expostulentur. Ita etsi nos compuleritis ad sacrificandum, nihil praestabitis diis vestris.

² Hom. iv. 7.

than all rulers.¹ Thus if there is once a conviction of the better, this conviction contains in itself the right to follow it, and no power on earth can resist it. The victory of Christianity was practically decided as soon as the Roman empire felt itself compelled, as we have to show in the following part of this work, to grant in the way of outward concession the religious principle which even the apologists had asserted.

¹ *Contra Cels.* v. 32.

2. THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO THE HEATHEN WORLD
AND TO THE ROMAN STATE, ON ITS OUTER SIDE.

IN judging of the relation of Christianity to the Roman state all that is generally considered is the series of persecutions which the Christians had to endure now under this and now under that Emperor. As the Romans were heathens they could only persecute Christianity, and if they did not do so, it was apparently merely by chance that they did not. The persecutions, however, we find, on closer examination, varied greatly in their nature and in the motives which gave rise to them: and in fact the attitude of the Roman State to Christianity varied as the general view which the heathen world took of it inclined to this side or to that. The whole series of phenomena which we have now to endeavour to set forth, are thus merely the outward reflection of that inner process with which we have become acquainted, which went on in the consciousness of the heathen world, and took the course which the nature of the case rendered necessary. So certainly as Christianity, the power of truth destined to prevail over everything, must come to take up more and more room in the consciousness of the heathen world and at last to take entire possession of it, so certain was it that a time was coming to the Roman state when it would be conquered and lay down all its power and rule in the hands of Christianity.

Born under Augustus and crucified under Tiberius, Christ stands at the head of the most important epoch of Roman history. These two phenomena, Christianity and the monarchy of the Roman emperors, appear in the world's history at the same time as equally great and momentous world-powers. But the first point at which they meet shows how little they are capable of existing together. It is not without special significance that we find it recorded in the annals of Roman history as well as in the New

Testament, that the founder of Christianity was condemned to death by the sentence of a Roman magistrate. "Auctor nominis ejus Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus:" so says the first Roman historian by whom Christianity and the Christians are mentioned, as if with studious design to perpetuate the fact with diplomatic exactness in the annals of the world's history, that this had been done by a Roman and in the name of the Roman State. Christian legend, on the other hand, tells that Tiberius recognised the divinity of Christ, and proposed to the senate that he should be worshipped. But this is merely an expression of the Christian desire to represent the strong and lively impression which would be produced upon the mind even of a Tiberius by the report, which it was natural to think he would receive, of the occurrences accompanying the death of Jesus, so making it the more certain that the deserved punishment should fall on the head of the man who had incurred this great guilt. Even under the Emperor Claudius history knows nothing of any contact of the Roman State with the Christians. Suetonius tells us¹ that Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome, because they were constantly raising tumults, impulsore Chresto. It is very probable that in this impulsor Chrestus² a dim reminiscence is preserved of the fact that Christianity then finding an entrance into Rome, and dividing the Jewish population of Rome into two parties, as was often the case in other places, gave an impulse to those disturb-

¹ In the *Vita Claudii*, c. 25. Compare Acts xviii. 2. Dio Cassius, lx. 2, says exactly the opposite, that Claudius did not expel the Jews from Rome. The following is thought to be the best way to harmonise the two accounts. In the year 41 Claudius put forth an edict which prohibited all Jews from residing at Rome. The number of Jews, however, was so great, that the general banishment of them thus ordained could not have been carried into execution without disturbances. Hence only some prominent persons among them, such as Aquila, were actually compelled to leave, and instead of carrying out the original edict, a decree was issued merely that the synagogues should be closed, and following this within the same year came a general edict of toleration (*Jos. Antiq.* xix. 5), of which the Christians also enjoyed the protection. Compare Lehmann, *Studien zur Geschichte des apostolischen Zeitalters*; Greifswald, 1856, p. 1, f.: Claudius und Nero; Gotha, 1858, p. 141 *seq.*

² The heathens used to say Chrestus instead of Christus (*Tert. Apol.* cap. 3).

ances which determined the emperor to adopt that measure. Here, however, Christianity appears still quite under the umbrella of the Jewish religion, as a *religio licita*,¹ a protection which of course could only extend so far for the Christians as it was granted to the Jews. In the reign of Nero for the first time are the Christians introduced into history in a manner worthy of them. When, as Tacitus tells us, the great conflagration under Nero² had destroyed the greatest part of the city of Rome, and popular report pointed persistently to Nero as the incendiary, he sought to meet these rumours by casting the blame upon others, and inflicting the most exquisite punishments on those whom the people called Christians,³ and hated on account of their infamous acts. In derision they were sewed up in the skins of wild beasts, torn to pieces by dogs, or nailed to the cross, or placed in clothes that were prepared with an inflammable material, and doomed to the death of fire, to serve by way of illumination at night. They were held convicted, as Tacitus says, not so much because the charge laid against them of being the authors of the conflagration had proved to be well founded, as on account of their general hatred of the human race.⁴ That is to say, they were not convicted at all; in place of the special crime which could not be imputed to them, a general charge was brought, which made them so deserving of punishment, that no special proof of facts was required against

¹ Tert. Apol. c. 21.

² Annal. xv. 44.

³ Quos . . . vulgus Christianos appellabat. Thus even in Nero's time this name was the current designation for them among the people. According to Acts xi. 26, the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch (*ἐγένετο—χρηματίζουσαι*, the expression can only indicate a title which had already become popular). The form of the adjective, however, being not Greek but Latin, does not make it probable that the name arose in a town where Greek was the language of the population. The author of the Acts says it came into use at Antioch: that town being with him the great metropolis of the Gentile Christianity which was first established there, this name by which the Paulinists liked to be designated was also, in spite of its Gentile origin, to proceed from there. The reason of their preference for this name was, as the Pseudo-Ignatius distinctly tells us (cf. my work *Ueber den Ursprung des Episcopats*, p. 181 *sq.*), that it was the most distinct expression as against Judaism for that Christianity which was emancipated from Judaism, and did not depend on Judaism for its importance.

⁴ *Haud perinde in crimine incendii, quam odio generis humani convicti sunt.*

them at all. If it was not proved that they had committed such a crime, at least they might well be held capable of it. Their odium generis humani was a disposition so hostile to all other men that those dealing with them were justified in disregarding all those observances by which men are generally bound in dealing with each other. They are thus marked off as a class of men who had only to thank themselves and their entire want of all humane culture and disposition, if all considerations of humanity were put out of court in dealing with them. This, then, was the view taken of the Christians by the Roman public of that age, and hence the *subdere reos* that we read of was tolerated: the matter was considered to be perfectly regular. Even Tacitus takes this view of the transactions; he says not a word to indicate disapproval of these atrocities: on the contrary, the expressions he uses in reference to Christianity show clearly enough that he considered the procedure against them to be sufficiently justified. What was done against the Christians at that time was thus merely the practical consequence of the view which the heathen world in general took of Christianity. It is true that the occasion of the Neronian persecution was a matter of chance, that the purpose which it had in view did not appear to be one that had to do directly with Christianity itself,¹ and that people saw in Christianity something quite different from what it really was. In spite of this the persecution was a murderous blow directed against Christianity itself. It was not an attempt to suppress it altogether, but it was a practical declaration that Christianity was to be suppressed, as everything

¹ According to Lehmann, *Studien*, etc., p. 9, the persecution is to be traced to the hatred of the Jews, and the originator of it was Nero's wife, Poppaea Sabina. According to Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. 8. this lady was a Jewish proselyte, and according to Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 22, she kept mathematicians, among whom Jewish magicians were reckoned, in great numbers about her person, and had the greatest influence with Nero. Thus her hand is to be traced at work in the persecution. This is a pure combination. E. Böhm in the *Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie*, iv. 3, p. 446, adopts the theory, and uses it even to account for the conflagration. The plan it was to serve was to destroy the old palace as a preliminary to the erection of the regnum Hierosolymorum promised to Nero by mathematicians! Suet. cap. 40.

bad and reprehensible ought not to be tolerated. It was thus the first beginning of that whole course of ill-treatment which Christianity had to suffer from the Roman State, and which might be expected to be renewed again and again as long as the view taken of Christianity by the State remained unchanged. The antithesis which existed essentially between the two great powers had now assumed the shape of a great historical fact; it could now be clearly seen how wide the antithesis was. On the side of the Christians, too, this conflict with the Roman State had the unavoidable effect of making them aware of the full extent of that repulsion which existed between the State and them. How could it be otherwise than that this, the first real persecution of the Christians, happening with all its scenes of martyrdom at a time when they were looking with the greatest suspense for the Parousia of Christ, and the tribulations by which it was to be accompanied, should fall with the most agitating effect not only on the Roman Church, but on the Christians in every place where the news was heard? Even though the persecution did not extend beyond the city of Rome, yet it could be regarded in no other light than as the first signal of the great catastrophe which was now to burst forth upon the world. In the Apocalypse, which was written only a few years afterwards, we have the most speaking and authentic witness to the deep and abiding impression which that persecution made on the whole Christian world. That work is in fact nothing else than the Christian counter-manifesto to the Roman declaration of war which was virtually made in the persecution. In those pictures of the Apocalypse in which the Roman Babylon is described, the woman drunk with the blood of the holy martyrs, how distinctly do we see the reflection of the bloody scenes of the Neronian persecution. Nero himself, the tyrant, who had been the first to commit so wicked an outrage against the Christians and Christianity itself, was now counted on all hands to be Antichrist. The writer of the Apocalypse declares that he is, and it is very probable that the well-known popular myth, which Tacitus and Suetonius assure us was so generally believed by the Romans

themselves, that Nero was still alive, that he was coming again, that he was to return as ruler from the East, that this myth proceeded from the Christians, and arose just from the necessity they were in to place him as Antichrist over against Christ.¹ Thus the Christians had no other view of the heathen world and the Roman State than the heathens had of Christianity. They also saw in that which stood against them nothing but a world deserving destruction, and with rapid steps advancing to it. Thus they would rather break altogether with the presently subsisting order of the world, and see it cut off all at once, and in the most violent way, by the intervention of the Lord appearing again from heaven in his glory, than give themselves to the thought that in it, on the ground of the Roman empire still continuing to exist and to develop itself in time, should be the scene where the idea of the

¹ Compare my Abhandlung über die Apokalypse, Theol. Jahrb. 1852, S. 325 sq., Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie, 1859, 4. 3: E. Böhmer, zur Lehre vom Antichrist, nach Schneckenburger, p. 441 sq. A not unimportant contribution to the history of that age which was agitated by the belief in Nero's return as Antichrist, appears to me to be contained in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. In my essay on the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, in the Theol. Jahrb. 1855, p. 141 sq., I have sought to show this. The author of the epistle, speaking in the name of the apostle Paul, gives an earnest exhortation *μη ταχως σαλειθηναι*, etc., ii. 1, not to be deceived by any one, nor be seduced into the belief that the day of the Parousia was now at hand. It appears very natural to refer this to the well-known Pseudo-Neronian disturbances, especially those mentioned by Tacitus, Hist. ii. 8. Sub idem tempus, Tacitus says of the time after the murder of Galba, when not only Otho and Vitellius, but also Vespasian, were about to resort to arms, all with the same intention, Achaia atque Asia falso exterritae, velut Nero adventaret, vario super exitu ejus rumore, eoque pluribus vivere eum fingentibus credentibusque.—Inde late terror, multis ad celebritatem nominis erectis. In those provinces which were the chief scene of this movement, Achaia, or Greece and Macedonia, including the town of Thessalonica, the Christians already constituted a considerable part of the population. Ewald correctly remarks, in his *Send-schreiben des Apostels Paulus*, 1857, p. 25, that it does not follow from the passage of Tacitus that a Pseudo-Nero had arisen by that time. It is all the more remarkable, however, that the mere rumour of the return of Nero, and the belief in it, this ludibrium falsi Neronis, was able to terrify so many people. That it was so may lead us to think that those who were terrified were principally Christians fearing the appearance of Antichrist. On the close relation in which the Antichrist, who is described in 2 Thess. ii., stands to the Apocalypse, see the essay above named. (See also the author's Paul, T.T.F.L., vol. ii. p. 314 sq.—Tr.)

kingdom of God should realise itself. From this harsh view of their relation to the Roman empire, the Christians could not even then disengage themselves, when the expectation of the Parousia subsequently ceased to occupy, as it did at first, the foreground of their consciousness. At the least they saw in the Roman empire the kingdom of the demons with all the *pompa diaboli*, and their Christian consciousness could only turn away with abhorrence from communion with such a kingdom of darkness. How many steps of approximation had to come between, before these harsh antitheses could come together to a unity of consciousness, and the Roman empire, and Christianity as the dominant religion of that empire, as the religion of the State, become identical notions? It is evident on the face of it that this could not come to pass till after a long struggle passing through various phases.

Notwithstanding this, history tells us nothing for a considerable time of the further fortunes of Christianity and the Christians in the Roman empire. The first who is mentioned as a persecutor of the Christians after Nero is Domitian, a *portio Neronis de crudelitate*, as Tertullian calls him;¹ but we have no distinct information about his time. The martyrdom of the apostle John in boiling oil, which is placed in his reign, is in any case a pure fiction. The name of a Clement appears in a remarkable way even in the pagan historians, under the reign of Domitian; but who can know what was the relation between the Flavius Clemens, executed by Domitian's orders, and the Christian Clement who was bishop of the Roman Church, and occupies so considerable a place in the traditions of that age? Even where there is very probably a reference to Christianity, what is named is atheism and Jewish customs, so that the supposition appears warranted that at this time Christianity was again under the umbraculum of the Jewish religion, and did not attract to itself, at least very specially, the attention of the Roman State. In the provinces the hatred of the population was easily excited against the Christians, and an act of persecution may have taken place here and there;

¹ *Apol.* cap. 5.

but these are mere isolated cases, and have no great importance for a more general view. The first positive help we get to fix the relation as to which we are inquiring, is the edict of the Emperor Trajan, occasioned by the famous letter of the younger Pliny. In the districts of Asia Minor of which Pliny was governor, in Bithynia, the number of the Christians appears to have increased very greatly in a short time. The heathen religion was deserted on a large scale, as Pliny's letter itself shows us, its temples stood forsaken, its festivals were no longer celebrated in the usual way, the animals for sacrifice found no purchasers. The consequence of this was a reaction from the heathen side. Christians of every age and rank, and of both sexes, were dragged before the tribunals, and the question now arose, and had to be decided, what right they had to be Christians. Pliny himself tells us very plainly that the Roman laws contained nothing to settle this point. He makes no secret of the embarrassment in which he was placed when Christians were brought before his tribunal. He had never had to do with any examinations of Christians, and did not know what was to be punished and what questions ought to be asked, whether a distinction should be made in respect of age, between children and grown-up people, whether there might be a retraction, or whether, if a man had once been a Christian, it should avail him nothing that he had ceased to be one, and whether the name in itself was punishable, even if there were no flagitia connected with it, or the flagitia cohaerentia nomini. The decision to which Pliny felt himself obliged to come on this question was that those who confessed to being Christians, and persisted, when warned, in their confession, ought to be punished. He said he was of opinion that whatever the nature of that which they confess might be, they, at all events, deserved to be punished for their contumacy and inflexible obstinacy. The general judgment to which he was brought, after all these exactly and strictly conducted investigations on the subject of Christianity, was that it was a *prava et immodica superstitio*, but that, far as the contagion had extended, not only in the towns, but also in the villages and

in the country, it might yet be checked if the mass of its adherents received an opportunity of recantation. Pliny laid the matter before the emperor, because it was new to himself, and he wished for more detailed information and instructions on it, and the answer of the emperor shows us still more distinctly what position the Christians then occupied in the Roman empire. Trajan approved of Pliny's opinions and conduct, and confessed that the matter was such that no general rule could be laid down about it at all. The Christians should not be hunted out, but if accused and convicted, they should be punished. But if one of them should say that he is not a Christian, and give a practical proof of the fact, *i.e.*, if he shows his reverence for the heathen gods, then he is to be forgiven on account of his recantation, whatever suspicions there may be against him on account of his past life. No attention is to be paid to anonymous informations, because it would be a bad example, and contrary to the spirit of the age of Trajan to do so. Looking at this latter point, Trajan's decision appears to be as fair and as merciful as could be expected from a pagan emperor. The motive underlying it may have been simply a conviction that an open exercise of power in the matter would only aggravate the evil, and that a fanaticism such as Christianity was in his eyes was certain to cool down of itself, if too much attention were not paid to it. But for all this we see that the consciousness of the age has changed its attitude with regard to Christianity. It is not now as in the expression with which Tacitus indicates the view of the age of Nero, an *exitiabilis*, but only a *prava et immodica superstitio*. It no longer counted for a thing entirely incompatible with the moral and social institutions of mankind, but only for an exaggeration, a thing exceeding the right measure. It was no longer thought that Christians as such were *per flagitia invisi*; it was asked, in the first place, if there were *flagitia nomini cohaerentia*. Punishment was only to be carried so far as it was necessary, and it was necessary, because, when Christianity openly appeared it presented an open contradiction of the Roman State religion which it was impossible to

tolerate. Thus Christianity was to be allowed to exist in the Roman State so far at least as it could be ignored. But how long could it be ignored, when it was always stretching out its hands to new conquests? And what had it to expect from the State, when even Pliny saw in it not now a mere piece of fanaticism, but a stiff-necked obstinacy, bidding defiance to the authority of the State, and challenging it to put forth its power, and when the emperor himself, in writing about them, used the plain words : *si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt?*

What, in fact, makes the edict of Trajan to mark an epoch in history, is that it for the first time formally and absolutely denies to Christianity a legitimate existence in the Roman State. Without any further investigation of his guilt being held necessary, the Christian name as such made every one who was once denounced as a Christian and refused to do the act denying his Christianity, a criminal worthy of death. Thus Trajan's decision, though it does not betray any intention directly hostile to Christianity, contained the harshest regulations with respect to it that could have been made, and the Christian apologists, looking at it from their point of view, could see in it nothing but a great injustice, at variance with all established notions of right, and containing a contradiction in itself.¹ The Christians were still regarded in the same light as before; the only difference was that the absolute sentence of condemnation now pronounced against them proceeded

¹ *O sententiam necessitate confusam!* exclaims Tertullian (*Apol. c. 2*) with regard to Trajan's rescript to Pliny, *negat inquirendos ut innocentes et mandat puniendos ut nocentes. Parcit et saevit, dissimulat et animadvertit. Quid temet ipsum censura circumvenis? si damnas, cur non et inquis, si non inquis, cur non et absolvis?*—*Christianum hominem omnium scelerum reum, deorum, imperatorum, legum, morum, naturae totius inimicum existimas et cogis negare, ut absolveras, quem non poteris absolvere, nisi negaverit. Praevaricaris in leges.* But it was only the Christians who thought the edict so unreasonable. They had no notion as yet that the heathens were only doing to them what would soon enough be the common practice of the Christian Church itself. Pliny says in the passage referred to that he thought himself obliged, in any case, to punish the *pertinacia et inflexibilis obstinatio* of the Christians. This refers to the refusal to deny the Christian faith and profess adherence to the faith in the heathen gods. The reason why the Christians became martyrs to their convictions was accordingly that the Roman State upheld the State religion, and could

not from the general human point of view, but from that of the Roman State.¹

The rescript of Trajan continued under the following emperors to be the legal rule for the treatment of the Christians. Solely on account of the name they bore they were regarded as criminals to be punished, as malefactors with regard to whom one was entitled to believe the worst without further proof. As the number of the Christians increased the hatred of the heathen population towards them rose also, and it happened more and more frequently that Christians were accused and executed for no reason but the Christian name.² There was no possible relief against so unrighteous a procedure, until the time should come when the whole view taken of Christianity in the Roman empire had undergone an essential

not leave unpunished those who expressly denied that religion, the *ἀθέους*. This is accordingly the chief point in Tertullian's Apologeticus also; it seemed to be perfectly self-evident that they were not punished qua Christians; the law of the State is confronted by the profound inner self-certainty of the Christian consciousness. *Nunc de manifestioribus dicam*, says Tertullian (Apol. c. 10), *Deos, inquit, non colitis.—Itaque sacrilegii et majestatis rei convenimur. Summa haec causa, immo tota est.—Deos vestros colere desinimus, ex quo illos non esse cognoscimus.* The question accordingly is, whether they are gods: *tunc et Christiani puniendi.—Sed nobis, inquit, dii sunt. Appellamus—ad conscientiam vestram—si poterit negare, omnes istos deos vestros homines fuisse.* Compare c. 24: *Laedimus Romanos, nec Romani habemur, quia non Romanorum Deum colimus.—C. 27: Igitur provocati ad sacrificandum, obstruimus gradum pro fide conscientiae nostrae—and prefer obstinatio to salus.* The characteristic of Trajan's edict is thus, that it regulates this relation from the point of view of the Roman State and the Roman State religion.

¹ The sentencing of the Christians ad bestias and their removal to Rome for that purpose, which is said to have been the fate of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, may have been nothing very uncommon even under Trajan, but having regard to the epistles, even in the Syrian text, and even after the defence of it by Lipsius in *Niedner's Zeitschr. für histor. Theol.* 1856, p. 76 *sq.*, the story of his martyrdom is very improbable. The fact is, probably, that in the year 115, when Trajan was spending the winter at Antioch, in consequence of the earthquake which happened this year, Ignatius fell a martyr to the rage of the people at Antioch itself. Comp. Clinton's *Fasti Romani*, vol. i., Oxford, 1845, p. 100 *sq.* The nearness of Trajan at the time was what caused the story to be gradually developed into the splendid tale of martyrdom which it became.

² Compare the greater Apology of Justin, cap. 2-4, and specially the second smaller Apology, where a very suggestive case of this sort is narrated. Also Eusebius; E. H. v. 21. Tert. Apol. cap. 2: *Illud solum expectatur, quod odio publico*

change. Thus it is very natural that the Christians, having among them even at this time men of sufficient culture and intellectual force to plead the cause of Christianity in powerful discourse, should have directed their energies principally to this quarter, and sought to modify public opinion in this direction. Thus the period immediately after Trajan's edict saw the appearance of the Christian Apologies, which were defensive writings addressed to the emperors, the governors of the provinces, and to the great public in general, and constituted a very considerable phenomenon of the time, setting forth in a characteristic way the position of Christianity in the empire. Whatever effect they may have had in the way of gradually enlightening the Roman world as to the general character of Christianity, they produced no result in the supreme potentates whom they were intended to influence. They cannot, in any case, be considered to have called forth those rescripts in which the next emperors after Trajan are said to have taken the Christians under their protection against the oppressions to which the edict of Trajan gave rise. Those documents bear the stamp of fabrication far too plainly on their face. How can we believe that a Roman emperor of that time could issue a rescript like that attributed to Antoninus Pius?¹ "I was of opinion," the emperor is made to write to the *Κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας*, the assembly of the delegates of the towns of Asia Minor, "that the gods would take care

necessarium est, confessio nominis, non examinatio criminis. Ad Scapulam, cap. 4: Quod aliud negotium patitur Christianus, nisi suae sectae? According to Volkmar, Theol. Jahrb., 1855, p. 227 sq., 412 sq., "die Zeit Justins des Märtyrers kritisch untersucht," both the Apologies of Justin belong to the reign of Antoninus Pius, about the year 150. The same procedure against the Christians is to be noticed in 1 Peter iv. 14 sq. Here there is an exhortation not to be actually, what the name *Χριστιανός* is supposed to imply that one is, a *κακοποιός*. The reference is so clear and distinct that it at once fixes the period of the edict of Trajan as the time when the epistle came into existence. Schwegler was the first to show this,—Nachapostolisches Zeitalter, ii. p. 11, sq.

¹ Justin, Apol. i. 70; Eusebius, E. H. iv. 13. In Eusebius it is an edict of Marcus Aurelius, although Eusebius says immediately before, cap. 12, that it was the emperor to whom Justin addressed his Apology, i.e. Antoninus Pius. Moreover, what Eusebius says at the end of cap. 13 of the confirmatory testimony of the bishop Melito of Sardis cannot refer to this edict as an edict of Marcus Aurelius ;

that such people (the Christians) should not remain hidden, for they would punish much more, if they could, those who will not worship them. You torment them and accuse them as if they were atheists in their way of thinking, and you reproach them with other things which we cannot prove. It can only be advantageous to them if they are seen to die for that which is laid to their charge; when they prefer giving up their bodies to doing what you require of them, they conquer us. It is unkind to remind you of the earthquakes which have happened and still happen. Compared with the Christians you lose your courage in such circumstances; they have far more confidence in God than you. At such a time you appear to know nothing of the gods, you neglect the sacrifices, you do not know how to worship God, and therefore you are envious of those who worship him, and persecute them to death. Concerning these people some other governors of provinces wrote to my divine father, and he replied to them that they should leave these people in peace if they do not attempt anything against the dominion of the Romans. And many have sent reports about them to me, and I also answered in accordance with my father's opinion. If any one has a complaint to bring against any of these people as such (as a Christian) the accused person is to be discharged even if it is shown that he is what is said, but the accuser is to be punished." Every word of this betrays the Christian writer, who makes the emperor give the heathens a lecture, while, with regard to the Christians, he speaks in exact accordance with the wishes of the Christians as to the way in which they would desire to be judged and dealt with by the Roman authorities. The emperor ends, in fact, with issuing commands exactly contrary to those of the edict of Trajan. There can be no doubt that the missives said to have been directed by the same emperor to Larissa, Thessalonica, Athens, and all the Greeks, in favour of for had Melito known of such a document he could not have omitted to mention it in his Apology; comp. Eusebius, iv. 26. This accordingly can only refer to the missives to Larissa, etc. The alleged edict arose, no doubt, under Marcus Aurelius, but was imputed to Antoninus Pius, in order to increase its influence by giving it the authority of the earlier emperor.

the Christians, belong to the same category.¹ Even the rescript of Hadrian,² which remained unquestioned until quite recently, cannot, when we look at it in its connection with the others, be freed from the same suspicion. The Emperor is said to have written to Minucius Fundanus, governor of Asia Minor, that he did not wish to leave undecided the matter brought up by his predecessor, Serenius Granianus, with respect to the Christians, lest the peace of the province should be disturbed, and opportunity given to sycophants for their wickedness. In future, therefore, the emperor ordains, the only permissible form for making an accusation against the Christians is to be this, that the accuser is to present himself to the court for speech and answer, and to undertake to convict the Christians of an offence against the laws. The judge is then to examine into the case with all carefulness. In case of conviction the punishment due to the crime is to be inflicted; but a calumnious accusation against a Christian, the emperor asseverates, is to be punished without mercy as the shamefulness of the case requires. It has been well shown,³ that this rescript is not directed, as is generally supposed, against disorderly and tumultuous proceedings on the part of the populace against the Christians. The practice which it presupposes as existing at the time—for it does not prescribe a new practice—is simply the judicial form of accusation, in which, however, the mere denunciation of any one as a Christian was sufficient for a conviction. If Hadrian had done something different from this—if he had ordained that the accusations brought against the Christians should be carefully looked into, the strictest procedure of law observed with regard to them, and only that punishment pronounced on them which was proportionate to the crime actually

¹ *περὶ τοῦ μηδὲν νεωτερίζειν περὶ ἡμῶν*, as Melito expresses himself in his Apology to Marcus Aurelius, in Eusebius, E. H. iv. 26, but without giving any further information about the contents, or mentioning specially the Rescript to the *Κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας*.

² Justin, Apol. i. 69. Euseb. E. H. iv. 9.

³ In the Theol. Jahrb. 1856, p. 387 *sq.*; Keim's Essay; *Bedenken gegen die Aechtheit des hadrianischen Christen-Rescripts*.

proved against them, this would have amounted to such a reversal of the edict of Trajan as we cannot well assume to have taken place. By the new rescript, which simply ignored the old one, and deprived it of all validity, the Christians would have obtained at once all that they could wish, that they should not be judicially condemned for the *nomen ipsum*, but only for the *flagitia coherrentia nomini*. This is exactly the difference which the edict of Hadrian makes, but which that of Trajan seeks to prevent from being made. The Christians could not understand a procedure which condemned them for nothing but their name, and as they felt strongly that what was connected with the Christian name was not only unproved, but incapable of proof, they held themselves entitled to apply to their accusers the term of sycophant.¹ In the eyes of the Christians they were this, but so long as Trajan's words, *si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt*, were still in force, and the general conviction of the time with regard to Christianity was that it was of essentially criminal character, sycophantic accusations of this kind could not take place. Thus this rescript also is a Christian fiction; its contents do not fit in to the historical connection of the preceding and the subsequent age.²

Under Antoninus Pius the Christians suffered harsher oppres-

¹ This expression which is used in the rescript is found also in the Apology of Melito, in Eusebius, iv. 26, and in Athenag. Leg. 1, 2.

² Neander, Church History (Bohn), i. 140, defends the genuineness of the rescript, but proves nothing in its favour. Even Melito (Euseb. iv. 26) knew the rescript: whether Justin Martyr was acquainted with it is doubtful, as the rescripts standing at the end of the greater Apology are merely tacked on to it. When oppressions and persecutions increased upon the Christians, protests were made against them in the form of alleged rescripts put in the mouth of former emperors. The words of Trajan (*Conquirendi non sunt*) might be interpreted to mean that the Christians were not to be punished so long as they committed no acts of a criminal nature. Thus the rescript of Hadrian would be merely a commentary on that of Trajan. And yet it can scarcely be thought possible that any one should venture to put forth such a document as that of Antonine to the *Koivὸν τῆς Ἀσίας*. In any case the two documents equally prove of what literary fictions that age was capable, if only the interests of Christianity seemed to require them, and how easily they were taken up by the Christians. So early a writer as Melito appeals at least in a general way to those rescripts, and his belief in them is such that he cannot go far enough in his *captatio benevolentiae* towards Hadrian and the Antonines.

flict with the Roman State became a pertinacia which deserved to be punished, and an inflexibilis obstinatio which must be broken by the power of the State.¹ As soon as the Christians, when brought before the tribunals, renounced their Christian faith, they were, as Marcus Aurelius also directed, set at liberty without further punishment.² This was the procedure observed with regard to the Christians during the whole period of the Antonines.³

It was not till the reign of the Emperor Septimius Severus, who became the monarch of the Roman empire in the year 193, and marks, in more respects than this, a turning-point in the history of the Roman emperors, that a change of view came about, as to the relation of Christianity to the Roman empire. By a succession of rulers of foreign extraction the imperial power lost, about this time, its national Roman character. The Emperor Septimius Severus himself was a thoroughbred African, and his wife Julia, a Syrian, and the emperors following Septimius Severus, Caracalla, Heliogabalus, Alexander Severus, belonged to their race, and were in their whole outward appearance more Orientals than Romans. Under their influence that religious syncretism came to be the prevalent way of thinking on religious matters with which, on the side it turned towards Christianity, we are acquainted from the work of Philostratus, or the life of Apollonius of Tyana, a work belonging to this period. Emperors whose leanings were in this direction could not feel the same interest in the Roman State-religion which the Antonines had so strongly asserted. It is true

¹ There can be no doubt that that ordinance of Marcus Aurelius was aimed specially at Christianity, that whosoever should introduce new and unknown religions, and especially those by which the *leves hominum animi* were excited and disturbed, should, according to his rank, be either banished or punished with death. See the passages in Gieseler, K.-g. I. i. p. 174.

² Euseb. E. H. v. 1.

³ An instance under Commodus in Euseb. E. H. v. 21. From Dio Cassius, lxxii. 4, we learn that Marcia, the concubine of Commodus, was kindly disposed towards the Christians, and the *Philosophoumena*, ix. 12, p. 287, confirm the account, speaking of the *φιλόθεος παλλακή Κομμοδού*, and saying that she directed inquiries to the Roman bishop Victor as to the Christian martyrs who were in the mines of Sardinia, and procured from Commodus an order for their release. In this way Callistus, who was also in this position, obtained his liberty.

that Septimius Severus must be counted among the persecutors of Christianity, and the persecutions under his reign are said to have been so violent in many places, that, as Eusebius says,¹ it was thought that Antichrist was close at hand. But it may be that his strict prohibition of a change of religion not only to Christianity but to Judaism as well was due to his syncretistic tendencies: his object may have been simply to check the encroachments by which these religions were injuring the heathen religion, and by restricting each religion to its own ground to hasten the time when it would be possible for the different religions to continue side by side.² At any rate we seem to be entitled to suppose that the Empress Julia was by no means a stranger to the religious syncretism which was so much at home in her family. She was herself of Syrian descent; and the grandchildren of her sister Maesa, Heliogabalus and Alexander Severus, the emperors who were the chief representatives of this syncretism, made the Syrian sun-worship of the East the foundation and ground-form of all other kinds of religion. The former of these two was himself a priest of the Temple of the Sun in the town of Emesa. Thus, in the great pantheon which Heliogabalus erected at Rome to his god, the god from whom he himself, his priest, took his name, the Jewish, the Samaritan, and the Christian religions were to be united with the Roman sacra. To the same worship did the pious Emperor Alexander Severus dedicate his *lararium*, where, in addition to the better Roman emperors and noble spirits, such as Apollonius of Tyana, Abraham and Orpheus, he also worshipped Christ. Thus at this period Christianity was no longer a wicked, immense superstition. If not the one and only true religion, yet it was as much a religion as any other; it also was one of the various forms in which the idea of religion is reflected, as the sun in the various clear surfaces on which its rays impinge. And if that be so, then it has the same right with other religions to exist and to have its

¹ E. H. vi. 7.

² Comp. Niebuhr, *Vorträge über römische Geschichte*, iii. 250:—"Characteristic of him was his leaning to strange religions."

own worship in the Roman empire. The Emperor Alexander Severus is said himself to have cherished the intention to build a temple to Christ, and to adopt him into the number of the Roman gods. There were accordingly no persecutions of the Christians during this period, except for a short time under Maximinus the Thracian; nor are there wanting stray indications of a disposition to regard the Christians with favour; in fact, one of the emperors of this period, Philip the Arabian, is said to have been a Christian himself.

It could not fail to be the case that in this long period of toleration and rest the Christians increased greatly in number. But at this time, when Trajanus Decius overthrew Philip the Arabian and obtained possession of the empire, there began a period of a very different character. The question at this time was no longer what view in general was to be taken of Christianity, how it was related to the general consciousness of the age, and to the circle of other ideas then in vogue, or what place was to be conceded to it alongside of the other religions subsisting in the Roman empire. We can see plainly that under the rule of the emperors of the last period, in whom Roman sentiment was not so strong, it had become a power so firmly established on the basis of fact, that emperors, in whom the old State-consciousness of Rome awakened in its full energy, could see in it nothing but an enemy, with whom a battle of life and death must come sooner or later. In the Christian persecutions, beginning about this time, we find, accordingly, the characteristic feature, that they did not proceed, as in so many cases previously, from the people, whose hatred and fanaticism drove the Roman authorities to persecute not unfrequently against their will, but from the head of the State himself. Thus they had quite a different character from the former persecutions, in which, as Origen says, "only a few persons, who could easily be counted, died at certain times for the Christian religion."¹ Now the persecutions are general measures, and extend over the whole empire; they are set on foot according to a certain principle, they are

¹ Adv. Cels. iii. 8.

methodically organised, and aim at no other end than the total suppression of Christianity. The emperor Decius was the first to conceive this plan, and though it suffered very great interruptions in the execution, it was never abandoned till the end of the period of the heathen emperors. In the year 250, as soon as he entered upon the government, Decius issued an order to all governors of the provinces, in which he threatened them personally with punishment, if they did not proceed against the Christians with all severity, and bring them back by fear and by all sorts of tortures to the Roman religion.¹ The execution of the imperial command was begun in this way. The Christians living in a place received notice that before a certain date they must renounce their religion and sacrifice to the heathen gods. If this was not done, the further steps were taken of examining them judicially and using force. At this period also there was no lack of instances of the Christian martyr-heroism, but the long peace which had gone before had impaired the zeal and courage of the Christians, and very many became unfaithful to the Christian profession, some of them openly, and some secretly. It was not undesigned, but was part of the plan of such a persecution, that it fell with the greatest force upon the bishops, as the heads of the churches. The punishment of death, which there was some reluctance to resort to at once in the case of the multitude of Christians, was inflicted chiefly upon them. Nor did the persecution come to an end after the death of the emperor Decius in the year 251. Public calamities, for which the Christians were always held responsible, excited the populace to an even greater degree against those who refused to take part in the sacrifices offered to appease the gods. After a short period of rest under Valerian the persecution burst forth afresh in the year 257, being again carefully planned, and beginning with the heads of the churches. There soon followed an edict still more severe, against the bishops, priests, and deacons, against the senators, the men of rank, the Roman equites, the matrons, the courtiers at the imperial court, who professed

¹ Eusebius, E. H. vi. 41.

Christianity. The notion was, not to punish Christians in general ; it was calculated that if once Christianity were driven out of the higher ranks, it would not be able to maintain itself among the masses of the people. Notwithstanding this, a longer period of rest now ensued. Gallienus, the son and co-regent of the emperor Valerian, who had been taken prisoner by the Persians, when he came to the undivided power, not only put a stop to the persecution which was still going on, but issued edicts which may be regarded as the first laws of toleration in favour of the Christians and of Christianity. He wrote to several bishops that it was his will that they should live in peace and security, and commanded the heathens to yield up to the Christians again their places of meeting and their burying-grounds.¹ We should be inferring too much, however, from these concessions, if we regarded them as giving to Christianity anything more than temporary toleration, or granting to it a right of existence which the State recognised. Yet under the reign of the following emperors also nothing was done against Christianity. Even Diocletian, whose illustrious name was made of such hateful memory for the Christians by the last great act of persecution, did not at first show a hostile disposition to Christianity. The Christian Church had never been in so flourishing a condition as it was then. It can hardly be told, so speaks Eusebius in passing to his discussion of this last period,² how much the Christian Church had increased during this time, both in extent and influence. Even the government of provinces had been intrusted to Christians by the emperor, and the Christians in the imperial palaces, who occupied not unimportant offices at court, were at liberty to exercise their religion. How could this state of things all at once undergo so great a change ?

The emperor Diocletian is recognised on all hands as having been one of the most competent rulers of the Roman empire. Niebuhr says of him,³ that as a man of rare understanding he saw

¹ Eusebius, E. H. vii. 13.

² *Ibid.* E. H. viii. 1.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 293. See also Vogel : *Der Kaiser Diocletian*, Gotha 1857, who describes him as a great emperor, and as the inaugurator of a new era for the empire.

that it was extremely dangerous to unite by force elements which tended naturally to separation, and, accordingly, to remove the many elements of division between East and West, thought out the seemingly curious system of giving to each a different government under a prince of its own; while the two princes were to be bound together by a common centre so as to form a whole. If this be so, there can be no doubt that in other things also he saw how little the heterogeneous elements which co-existed in the Roman empire admitted of being held permanently together at any common point of unity. His sentiments in matters of religion may be gathered from the preamble to the law, which he promulgated in the year 296 against the sect of the Manichaeans, which even then was pressing into the Roman empire.¹ "The immortal gods have well ordained and settled in their providence what is true and good. Many good and wise men are agreed to hold this fast unchanged. It is not right to oppose these; an old religion must not be condemned by a new one. For it is the greatest crime to undo what has once had its usage and course from of old, and has taken firm possession and subsistence." These sentences express the genuine Roman view of the relation of the State to religion. We shall have an entirely erroneous idea on the subject, if we suppose that the question as to the recognition of Christianity in the Roman State must have been decided according to our notions of the general rights of man, of toleration, and of freedom of conscience. Such notions and principles lay as yet quite beyond the sphere of vision of the ancient world. A man was to believe, not what he recognised as truth in the light of his own free convictions, but only what was stamped by the authority of tradition as the truth publicly recognised. The only question to be asked in matters of religion was, what was old and what was new. It was in accordance with this view that Diocletian passed his law against the Manichaeans. Now what was the application of this view to Christianity? Christianity also stood as a new religion over against the Roman State-religion, and it had hitherto been treated

¹ See Gieseler, K.-g., i. 1, p. 311.

accordingly. But now, when it had maintained itself nearly 300 years, and had even grown to be an important power in the State, the question might very justly be asked, whether it was still to be regarded as a *nova religio*. In any case, there was no ignoring the fact that it could not now be thrust out from the possession it had gained in all these years without the greatest exertions and a very dangerous convulsion of the State. We see these reflections actually at work when we are told of Diocletian,¹ that he, an old man, had long withstood the most urgent solicitations to set on foot a persecution of the Christians, representing how dangerous it was to disturb the peace of the world and shed the blood of so many people. The Christians have a way of embracing death with pleasure, and it is enough to keep the courtiers and the soldiers away from this religion. On the other hand, however, Christianity could not be left in the enjoyment of the power which it possessed, nor suffered quietly to extend itself further, without giving up the principle of the Roman State. At a time when the Empire required to summon up all its powers to resist the pressure of so many enemies, everything depended on the force of arms and the success of military undertakings. And to what quarter, according to heathen notions, was one to look for this success but to the heathen gods, and how could these gods grant success, if at the sacrifices at which they were to manifest their favour, they were offended and repelled by the presence of so many Christians in the army, and of the hated symbol of the cross? Thus, whatever view might be taken of Christianity, its relation to the Roman State had to the latter become a question of life and death. The Emperor Caesar Galerius, being of a warlike character, and attached to the Roman sacra, held this point of view very strongly with regard to the position of the empire at the time. The chief impulse to the last decisive struggle is said to have come from him and Hierocles, the Governor of Bithynia. It is significant that the persecution began, as Eusebius expressly tells us, in the army. There were many Christians in high posi-

¹ Lactantius, *de mort. persec.* cap. 11.

tions in the army. No objection had hitherto been raised to their presence there on account of their religion, but now it was thought more and more questionable that profane persons should be present at the sacra. Soldiers who would not take part in the sacrifices were removed from the army, and all of them sentenced to death. This was the beginning of the persecution. Diocletian ceased to set himself against the impetuosity of Galerius, and the storm burst upon the Church in all its fury.¹ Three edicts against Christianity

¹ The striking phenomenon of so sudden and so great a change in the relations hitherto existing, the change from a toleration to which no one objected, to the most violent persecution, has received some attention at the hands of the most recent historian of this most remarkable period of the history of the empire, I mean Burckhardt, *die Zeit Constantins des Grossen*, Basel, 1853, p. 325 *sq.* He thinks that the question assumes another appearance when we consider the details of the position. If the government had had any idea of persecuting at a future time, it could never have allowed the Christians to grow up as they did, without resistance, till they became a power in the State. It may be said that the government became aware only late in the day, and only by degrees, that if absolute toleration were practised, Christianity would strive to gain the preponderance. But Diocletian was not so thoughtless. In judging of the case, we must start from the consideration that we are speaking of one of the greatest of the Roman emperors, a saviour of the empire and of civilisation, who had a most acute understanding of his age. If he had died in the year 302 his political memory would be very different from what it is now. What we have to do is to inquire whether what darkens this memory was a mere outbreak of cruelty and brutality which belonged to the man's nature, or was occasioned by superstition, or was a piece of wretched weakness towards his co-regents who stood so far below him. Or is it not the task of the historian to seek here for some way of escape not suggested by the written letter? This way of escape is thought to have been discovered in the supposition that the emperors believed themselves to have detected a plot of the Christians, who, conscious of their growing numbers and influence, were seeking to put themselves in possession of the imperial power. Some of them, perhaps only a very few Christian courtiers, and some Christian military commanders in the provinces, thought they could strike a *coup d'état* which would bring the imperium into the hands of Christians, or of persons friendly to the Christians; and perhaps they meant in doing this to spare the persons of the emperors. This hypothesis is supported by combinations which are too artificial and too venturesome to count upon much acceptance; and even were it more probable than it is, it does not really bring us any further. Taking Diocletian's political wisdom and greatness as a ruler for our starting-point, it remains as incomprehensible as ever, if the catastrophe is so enigmatical as it is said, how a conspiracy not promoted by the Christians in general, but confined to a very few associates, could determine such an emperor to adopt measures, the far-reaching consequences of which, for the State, no one can have

and the heads of the Christian churches appeared in rapid succession in the year 303; and in the year 304 another was promulgated against the Christians in general; all of them allowing free course to the fanaticism of the people and the caprice and cruelty of the magistrates. The position of the Christians, however, varied very much, especially after the first storm was over, in accordance with the dispositions and the political interest of the various rulers

foreseen better than himself. Thus we are just thrown back upon the general position of affairs at the time for our guidance. Burckhardt's position leads him to form a very unfavourable opinion of the work extant under the name of Lactantius, *de mortibus persecutorum*. But whether written by Lactantius or by another, and however mean an opinion we may form of its literary value, it cannot well be denied that with all its misrepresentations and exaggerations it contains historical data capable of being used to good effect in the history of the period. Thus Burckhardt reckons it a great piece of folly in this writer to say that Diocletian, when he could no longer withstand Cæsar Galerius, *hanc moderationem tenere conatus est, ut eam rem sine sanguine transigi juberet, cum Caesar vivos cremari vellet, qui sacrificio repugnassent* (c. 11). But the edicts do not expressly mention any *rem sanguine transigi*, and the account of this writer is quite credible in this point, that Diocletian was only drawn gradually by his co-regents, from one step to another, deeper and deeper, into measures of persecution. Vogel, *op. cit.*, p. 109, accepts the account of Lactantius that Diocletian was not free in those transactions, but was in the hands of others, under the influence of the priests and of Galerius. Nor can, he says, the possibility of a connection with the revolts of the year 303 be well denied; only, Vogel thinks, all these things would never have forced Diocletian to the momentous act, had it not been a thing which his own theory required, a consequence of his own principles to which he had till now been restrained from giving effect by his disposition, by his understanding, and by the difficulties in the way of the consolidation of his power; but how reconcile these two things, the want of freedom and this inner tendency, and how can we understand, if his persecution of the Christians was so much in harmony with his principles, that he was so long of doing anything in this direction, and then went the full length all at once? We are thus brought back to the view that he only gave way to the urgency of others, and when the first step had once been taken, was obliged to take the others too. It can have come from nothing but his policy that he did not try before with regard to Christianity those measures which he had used in all their severity against Manichæism. But it seems very clear that in the Christian persecutions he had a distinct intention. If he, as no other, caused himself to be worshipped as God, if he regarded himself as the high-priest, as it were, of a heathen State-church, and presented himself even outwardly as Zeus incarnate, ruling the world (comp. Vogel, p. 29 *sq.*, 39), it may well be, that having a presentiment of the approaching end of all this magnificence, he sought to overawe Christianity with all the splendour of the majesty of a Roman emperor in oriental style.

who administered the different provinces of the empire along with and after each other during the course of those eight years. The ecclesiastical writers write of the persecution in an exaggerating way, and cannot sufficiently describe its great severity, nor dilate with too great vividness upon the scenes which occurred in it.¹ A much more important task than to follow their narratives of martyrdoms is to attempt to seize those points of transition from which at last there proceeded as the great result, the very opposite of what the persecution was at first intended to bring about. Galerius himself, the chief instigator of the policy pursued up to this time, became convinced that it could not be successful, and turned to other thoughts. In April of the year 311 he issued from Nicomedia, in concert with Constantine and Licinius, the first of those remarkable edicts on religion² in which the triumph of Christianity over heathenism and over the Roman State was announced to the world as an accomplished fact.

The three emperors above-named say in their edict:³ "Among other matters which they had devised for the good of the State, they had also determined to restore all things to the old laws and the discipline of the Roman State, and to see that the Christians also, who had left the sect of their ancestors, should return to good dispositions. For the Christians have been seized in a certain methodical way with such arrogance and such folly, that they did not observe those institutions of the ancients, first established perhaps by their ancestors, but made themselves laws according to their caprice and their own notions of what was right, in consequence of which they had founded various communities in various ways. When the command was issued that they should betake

¹ Niebuhr remarks, p. 295, that the persecution was not so dreadful as it is generally represented. Dodwell, he says, is quite right, that it was not even a shadow of what was done by the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands.

² In Lactantius, *de mort. persec.* c. 34. Eusebius, *E. H.*, viii. 17.

³ Compare Keim, *die römischen Toleranzedikte für das Christenthum* (311-313) und ihr geschichtlicher Werth. *Theolog. Jahrb.*, 1852, p. 207 *sq.* Burckhardt, p. 395, only mentions these edicts cursorily, and enters into no closer discussion of them. Keim's Essay is worthy of attention.

themselves back to the institutions of the ancients, many were induced by the danger to submit themselves. But as most of them persisted in their purpose, and they (the emperors) had seen that they neither showed fitting honour to the gods, nor held to the God of the Christians, they desired, according to their custom of being gracious to all, to extend their grace to them also, on the condition that they should be Christians again, and should so arrange their meetings as to do nothing contrary to discipline. Now, therefore, according to the grace that has been shown to them, they are to pray to God for the welfare of the emperors and of the State, and for their own, that the State may continue well preserved in every respect, and they live quietly in their dwellings." The edict exhibits a remarkable contradiction of history. The persecution of the Christians by Diocletian is said to have been aimed not at Christianity itself, but only at that sectarianism which was undermining Christianity, and to have been undertaken not with a view to bring the Christians back to heathenism, but only to make them true Christians again. And what a contradiction it is, that although the Christians did not obey the imperial command, but persisted in their own way, and worshipped neither the heathen gods nor the God of the Christians, yet the imperial grace and forgiveness is to be extended to them. The only explanation of this contradiction is that it was desired to place Christianity in a different relation to the State, without acknowledging openly that the view hitherto taken of it had undergone a change. What the edict is to proclaim for the first time is spoken of as a relation already long subsisting; as if the State had become reconciled to Christianity long ago, it desires to have it as that only which in its true nature it is. In order to make it appear that the act of recognition made thus tardily has not been wrung from the State by necessity, the *corrigere cuncta juxta leges veterum et publicam disciplinam Romanorum*, which was alleged to have been the true object of the recent persecution, is represented as merely a reverting to the *instituta veterum*. Christianity accordingly is quietly reckoned among the *instituta veterum*, and the persecution

is said to have had an intention corresponding to this, as if it had referred not to the Christians as such, but only to the love of innovation of the Christian founders of sects. To this view of Christianity, as one of the *instituta veterum*, had the want of success which attended the persecution forced its authors to come; what withstood all attempts to suppress it proved itself thereby to be an old-established institution. Accordingly the recognition which was now extended to it on the part of the State took this form, that it was to subsist in the State in so far as it was and remained what it had been from the beginning, and did not degenerate into any caprice or innovation. This is the true notion of a *religio licita*. According to the view of antiquity, which, in matters of religion and politics regarded nothing with so great an aversion as *νενεπίζειν*, the State could not by a special act make a religion a *religio licita*: the religion itself made itself this by its historical existence and the right of prescription, and all the State could do was accordingly to pronounce that right to exist, the real foundation of which lay in its origin and past history. But the great change which had now come about in the view taken of Christianity embraced the further point, that not only was it to be allowed to exist in the State, but it seemed necessary, in the interests of the State itself, to concede to it all the rights of a State-recognised religion. If it had been held with regard to the Christians till now, that they were subverting the State, they were now exhorted to pray for the welfare of the State, which was now looked for not only from the heathen gods, but from the God of the Christians too. Only we must not overlook that it is in one form of Christianity alone that the State is willing to repose this confidence. The distinction drawn in the edict between original and sectarian Christianity may have been meant first of all to provide a legal justification of the step which the State was now to take in recognising Christianity; but it was also intended to set forth the condition on which alone the recognition was made, namely, that it applied only to the original, true Christianity, which was at one with itself, or to the Christianity of the Catholic

Church, to which alone the category of *instituta veterum* could be properly applied.

This first edict was followed in the spring or summer of the year 312, before the fall of M^axentius, by a second, issued by Constantine and Licinius. This document not having been preserved to us, we are not acquainted with its exact contents, but we are able to infer what they were from the third edict, which was issued by the same two emperors at Milan in the beginning of the year 313, and directly refers to it.¹ The two edicts have thus to be taken together. In the third, which has been preserved to us, the emperors say:—"As we have long perceived that religious liberty ought not to be denied, but that freedom must be given to every one to manage his religious affairs according to his own conviction and choice, we have commanded that every one, and the Christians among the rest, shall keep his religion (without having another thrust upon him). But as many and various conditions were added to that edict, in which this liberty was conceded (the second), many have perhaps been repelled again, after a little while, from this cultus."² The emperors say they have met at Milan to consult regarding affairs of State, and had felt themselves especially called on to regulate matters relating to religion, in order to grant to the Christians and to all full religious freedom, so that all the gods in heaven might be gracious and favourable to them and to their subjects. "They have therefore considered it to be the most salutary and useful course, in no way to refuse freedom to any one to turn either to the cultus of the Christians or to

¹ Lact. de mort. persec., c. 48. Euseb. E. H. x. 5. Lactantius omits the introduction which Eusebius places in the emperors' mouths, and begins with the new provisions determined on at Milan in the year 313.

² Ἐπειδὴ πολλὰ καὶ διάφοροι αἵρέσεις ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἀντιγραφῇ, ἐν ᾗ τοῖς αὐτοῖς συνεχωρήθη ἡ τοιαύτη ἐξουσία, ἐδόκουν προστεθεῖσθαι σαφῶς, etc. This is the fatal passage, from which chiefly it has come that the true meaning of these edicts has been as yet so little understood. Eusebius uses the word *αἵρέσεις* for the conditions of Lactantius, and it has always been thought that sects were spoken of. It is true that Eusebius uses the word *αἵρεσις* in this sense immediately before our passage, but *αἵρεσις* is sometimes equivalent to *conditio*; and as Lactantius in his original text speaks immediately after of conditions where Eusebius speaks of *αἵρέσεις*, it is difficult to see how the passage could be so seriously misunderstood.

the religion which he judged the most suitable for himself, in order that the highest Deity, being obeyed with a free spirit, may show himself in all things favourable and benevolent. For this reason they have determined, after removal of all and every condition such as were contained in the former edict with regard to the Christians,¹ to take care that every one who wishes to adhere to the Christian religion may do so quite undisturbed and unmolested. They therefore announce that they have given to the Christians absolute freedom and warrant for their religious cultus, and others also are to have the same open and unlimited religious liberty, so that every one may worship whatever divinity he pleases, because they do not desire to detract anything from any cultus or any religion." We are at once struck with the repeated and studious assurance given in this edict of full and unconditional religious liberty, especially with regard to the Christians. We may confidently infer from it that this was the point where the preceding edict had come short of giving the desired satisfaction; in fact, it is expressly stated that the new edict is intended to remove those conditions by which it might be felt that limitations were still imposed on religious liberty. Thus we see that the Christian religion cannot have been allowed to every one—that there must have been some prohibition to the heathens to go over to it. We are thus obliged to suppose that, after the edict of the year 311 had declared the public toleration and recognition of Christianity, very many who were already Christians at heart, though outwardly still adhering to the heathen cultus, now openly went over to Christianity. And this doubtless was the reason that the emperors thought it incumbent on them to intervene with a measure of prevention and limitation, to restrain the going over to Christianity, at least on so large a scale. This was the object of the edict of the year 312. The fact that it was followed in so short a time by a third edict of so directly contrary tenor, as well as the contents

¹ *Amotis omnibus omnino conditionibus, quae prius scriptis—super Christianorum nomine videbantur. Comp. Eus. : ἵν' ἀφαιρεθείσων παντελῶς τῶν αἰρέσεων, αἵτινες κ.τ.λ. καὶ ἅτινα πᾶν σκαῖα καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας πραύτητος ἀλλότρια εἶναι ἐδόκει ταῦτα ἰφαιρεθῇ.*

and the whole style of the latter, point indisputably to a state of commotion and fermentation caused by the imposition of the new compulsory measures, and the prospect of further compulsion among the whole Christian population, and especially the population of the countries of the West. The discontent thus aroused must have been pronounced so unmistakably that the two emperors saw themselves compelled to declare, in the plainest and most unconditional way, that entire religious liberty was to be allowed in future, and that especially with regard to Christianity no doubts or anxieties of this sort were now to arise.¹ They would have the less difficulty in dealing thus with the public anxiety, as there can be no doubt that, even with the greater part of the heathen population, persecutions of the Christians were no longer regarded with favour.

But we should mistake the tendency of these three edicts, and especially of the last one, in which the two others reach their termination, did we suppose it to have been their object merely to set up the principle of universal religious liberty. It is plainly to be seen that Christianity is the centre of all the provisions contained in those edicts, and that reference is made to the other religions and to religious liberty in general, only in connection with the position which it is desired to give to Christianity. The Christians are the principal persons; every one is to be at liberty to go

¹ Maximin, the ruler of the countries of the East, also issued proclamations in consequence of the three edicts, and of similar tenor. The edict of the three emperors of the year 311 is represented by the proclamation of the procurator Sabinus, quoted by Eusebius in an unsuitable place, ix. 1. Sabinus can only have issued this proclamation under the directions of Maximin. Here also toleration is granted to the Christians, if, giving up their own caprice, they come together to the firmly closed unity of their *ἴδιον ἔθνος*, their religion, their cultus. This belongs to the spring of the year 311. Half a year later Maximin was again persecuting the Christians (Euseb. ix. 2). Soon afterwards he issued the edict of Euseb. ix. 9, 10, which answers to the two edicts of the emperors. According to the latter of the year 313, it appears that in the earlier one of the year 312 he also desired to grant rest to the Christians, under the condition of a worship that was united, and came together to a compact whole; *εἰάν τις βούλοιτο τῷ τοιούτῳ ἔθνει* (the *ἔθνος Χριστιανῶν*) *ἢ τῇ αὐτῇ φυλακῇ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐρησκέας ἑπείσθαι*, Euseb. ix. 10.—Keim, *op. cit.* pp. 216, 229 sq.

over to them; they are to have complete liberty, and only that they may enjoy it without limitation are others to have it as well. This appears very plainly in the special provisions in favour of the Christians which are contained in the second part of the third edict. Their places of meeting and church property, if they have been bought by others or acquired by way of gift, are to be given back to the *corpus Christianorum*, the Christian Church, without any hesitation, and without the least demand of any price, except in so far as the State holds out some prospect of compensation. The governors are to set on foot with all energy the work of restoring these possessions, and they are to be restored without delay, that in this point also due care may be taken for the public peace, and that the divine grace, already experienced in so great matters, may still further accompany the undertakings of the rulers. When we consider how immediately the concessions here made to the Christian Church were followed by other ordinances passed by Constantine in favour of the Christians, as in particular the exemption of the Christian clergy from burdensome public services, which was granted so early as March 313; when we consider further the tone of profound respect in which the Christian Church is spoken of in the documents of the period; again, in how obliging and liberal a way Constantine behaved even at this time to the heads of the Christian churches, and how the bishop Hosius of Cordova, who came afterwards to advise him in such weighty matters, was even then, in the year 313, standing at his side,—we see, in a word, that even in the edict of the year 313 the step was taken by which Christianity was elevated to the religion of the State. Yet from the very first it is meant to be distinctly understood that it is only Christianity in the Catholic Church, with which, meeting it in its representatives, the State desires to enter into this new relation. The first edict states it as the chief objection to be made against the Christians that they are divided into sects and parties, and in the third edict it is repeatedly said that all the concessions made to the Christians are meant to apply only to the *corpus Christianorum*; they are to be extended to the Christians

only in so far as they form a great corporation, namely, the Catholic Church. Here we touch probably the deepest point of the sympathy by which Constantine felt himself attracted to Christianity and the Christian Church. Nothing is more characteristic of him, and nothing lets us see deeper into the inner moving powers of this remarkable period of transition, than the genuinely catholic interest and desire for unity which Constantine brought with him from his political standpoint, and which enabled him to meet the Church halfway. This was the principle of the regeneration of the Roman Empire which was now about to come to pass in Christianity, and after which even Diocletian had been striving in his system of reorganisation when he sought to arrest the process of the disintegration of the empire, and to hold it energetically together by means of a plurality of rulers. In no other point had Constantine a better understanding with the Christian Church, in no other point do we see so thoroughly as here the same Constantine before us from the beginning to the end. He was in the year 313 just what he was afterwards, the emperor who fraternised with the bishops, who, in fact, aimed at being himself nothing but a bishop, who regarded the calling that he had as the highest guardian of peace, as equally divine with that of the bishops, and counted himself happy if only the bishops regarded him as their associate and colleague.¹ Eusebius gives, along with the edict of 313, a number of other writings of the emperor more or less contemporary with it,² and it is certainly remarkable how we find in them again and again the same characteristic trait of a powerful desire for unity. Concord and unity are everywhere his first requirement; nothing distresses him more than division among the people or strife among the bishops. In theological questions and controversies he sees nothing but unseemly disputes, a love of strife, private feuds, bad dispositions, perversity, godlessness, madness. The originators of such controversies are men of no right disposition or behaviour, seducers of the people of the most holy Catholic Church, who

¹ Eusebius, *Vita Const.* i. 44; ii. 68, 69; iv. 24.

² Eusebius, *E. H.* x. 5-7.

forget not only the duty of brotherly unity, but even the respect which they owe to the most holy faith, and turn Christianity into a laughing-stock for those who do not believe in it. It is therefore his warm desire to put a stop to controversies, and bring back everything to the proper service and faith; indeed, he speaks, even in the summer of the year 313, of the reverence he feels for the Catholic Church, and which impels him to ask the bishops not to allow any kind of schism or division in any place, as of a fact with which Miltiades, bishop of Rome, to whom he was writing, was well acquainted. To restore this unity where it had been disturbed, he regarded, even at this date, as both his right and his duty, because it lay heavy on his heart that there should be divisions in the provinces which divine providence had committed to him. The controversies which occurred in those times, the Donatist and the Arian, gave the emperor abundant opportunity to put those principles in practice. The zeal with which he sought to restore the unity of the Church, which these controversies had disturbed, was the fruit of a strong conviction that unity, as everywhere, so particularly in religion, was the most essential condition of the strength and might of the empire. That this idea was the leading maxim of his government we learn from himself. He expresses it in various places, but most distinctly in the missive which he sent to Alexandria, on hearing of the outbreak of the Arian controversy, addressed to the heads of the two parties, Alexander the bishop, and Arius the presbyter.¹ Here he begins by saying that the first object he had proposed to himself was to unite the religions of all nations, that they should have the same form and nature; and the second, to restore to health the body of civil society, which had suffered as it were from a grievous sickness. On the first object he had fixed his thought with the hidden eye of the mind, the other he had sought to bring about by military force, in the conviction that if he should succeed in his desire, and bring to pass general unity among all the servants of God, the fruit of this would be seen in the body politic, as well as in a

¹ Eusebius, *Vita Const.* ii. 64 sq.

change answering to the pious disposition of all. Then after expressing the utmost indignation at the intolerable frenzy which in the Donatist schism had seized the whole of Africa, and in the most thoughtless and inconsiderate way had rent into different heresies the religion of the churches, he cannot sufficiently deplore that now he is obliged to hear of a new and yet more grievous division. The whole tendency of his epistle is thus to insist with all emphasis upon the duty of general unity. This is regarded as the one thing to be kept in view; to such an extent indeed is this position taken up, that in comparison with this great end even such a controversy as the Arian appears to be occupied with quite subordinate and unimportant matters. He desires to step between the contending parties in the character of supreme ruler for peace, and to adjure them to cease of their own accord from the temptations of the devil. The great God and the common Redeemer of all, he says, has made the common light to arise for all; and surely they may suffer him, the servant of God, under his providence to bring his endeavours to a good end, that by his address to them and by his efforts and the urgency of his exhortation the churches of God may be brought to a common unity. If there was agreement on the main point, divisions and separation must not be allowed to arise for the sake of such unimportant controversies. At the synod at Nice he expressed himself in the same way, and declared it to be the highest of all blessings to see before him an assembly in which general unity of view and disposition prevailed.¹ This, and in fact all the points which we have passed in review, are so intimately connected with the programme of his reign which he set forth in the edict of Milan, as to bring before us with sufficient clearness how the thought of unity and the effort after unity, the monarchical tendency, was the principle which from first to last determined his individuality.

What further light do we still require in order to a historical comprehension of the character of the epoch of which Constantine is the principal figure? Are we to find the key to the explanation

¹ Eusebius, *Vita Const.* iii. 12, 17, 21.

of it in the legend, so ambiguous, and in spite of its authentic voucher, so unauthenticated, of the miraculous vision which is said to have appeared to Constantine on his march against Maxentius?¹ In such an account of the matter let those find satisfaction to whom petty personal matters are wont to stand higher than the great process of history, and in whose eyes the strange and miraculous is of more value than the simple truth of historical facts. Nay even that question which is generally held to be the most signal example, in this field of history, of that method of historical treatment which seeks to trace results to their causes, whether Constantine's going over to Christianity and the consequent elevation of Christianity to the State religion, was a matter more of politics or of inner religious conviction on Constantine's part, is without any real importance. It cannot possibly lead to a correct view, because it sets out by seeking to reduce the historical importance which Christianity reached in Constantine to a mere momentum of his personality, and is only in doubt whether it owed this importance more to the politics of Constantine or to his religion. But we may say in general that Christianity was indebted, for the importance which it then attained, to no one but itself. Accordingly, if a distinction of this nature be drawn at all, it must be answered in favour of the politics of Constantine, since politics are nothing but a correct appreciation of the relations which determine the centre of gravity of an age. Christianity had

¹ In the treasury of anecdote of Neander's Church History this legend could not of course be wanting. The incident is not to count as a miracle, for we stand on the platform of a Christian view of history. But instead of this we have psychological analysis, and the result of this psychological watering down of history is as follows:—"Now it is very possible, that either of himself or hearing it suggested by the Christians in his company, he thought he saw in the shape of the clouds or in some other object the figure of the cross. Thus he was led to conceive the hope that he would conquer through the might of the God of the Christians," etc. Thus the great world-historical revolution of those times was due to the chance occurrence of a certain shape in the clouds, such as may serve to amuse a child's fancy. Compare the apt remarks of Keim on Neander's view, *op. cit.* p. 251, and Burckhardt, p. 394 *sq.* It is also inconceivable how Neander can separate the second and third edict from the first by placing a period between them.

become an objective power of the age, and carried in itself the necessity of being recognised. The greatness of Constantine, what makes him one of those world-historical characters who are the individual expression of the spirit of their age, is simply and solely this, that he understood his age, and had the capacity to take up into himself, and to join with himself in a personal unity, what the genius of the time had to deposit in his hands in Christianity. Though so significant a warning had gone forth between the second and the third edict, the right time had not yet gone by for the world freely to measure itself with Christianity. The last great attempt against Christianity had been without result, and had only exposed the weakness and powerlessness of the heathen world, and the inner dissolution which had seized upon the ancient faith. It was now evident that the substantial power of the age was Christianity, and that alone, as the *Corpus Christianorum* with the strong, well-articulated organisation of the Catholic Church. Only in this form did Constantine know Christianity, and it was only the grand unity to which the episcopal system of the Church had even then been developed, which excited in him so great reverence. Thus he came to see in the Christian Church the power by which the Roman empire, so much in need of regeneration, could gain the strength and capacity needed for that process. Thus there was an approach on both sides, in the interests not less of the one than of the other. The real power of the age resided in Christianity alone: amid the dissolution of all the forms which held the old world together, it only formed a firm and compact unity, in which it was able to offer a new body to the State now falling to pieces. On the other side, it was no less for the interests of Christianity that the form of the Roman empire, founded as it was in history, should be that in which it became the ruling power of the world. In a word, if there was still to be a Roman empire, this was possible only under the condition that a Christian emperor should now stand at its head. Thus it was nothing but an inner necessity, lying in the changed relations of the world themselves, which forced the two powers to come together into one: on the one side,

Christianity, in the form of the Church and the episcopate, which now once more built the bridge over which Christianity went forward to a new stage of its historical development; and on the other, the Roman empire, being still in name at least what in reality it was no longer. It is nothing but the objective process of the thing itself that provides the force for further motion. In the life of Constantine, in fact, there is no personal information as to the decisive step of his going over to Christianity. Indeed he even postponed his baptism, as if such an act had ceased to be necessary for him, the Christian emperor, to the very end of his life. Thus considered, the whole change which we are now considering has an entirely political character, and history has in reality no great object for inquiring what relation Constantine's own religious convictions bore to the great process.¹ Yet the religious element, in so far as it belongs to the question at all, does in a certain way assert itself. When a power has advanced by the road of historical development, and come to be a patent and evident objective reality, it must be held to be religion in a man that leads him to recognise it for what it is, to see in it a divine evidence, and in the consciousness of his own subjective dependence to bow before it as a higher power. This kind of religiosity we cannot in any case deny to Constantine. If we are to put the question as to his religion, there can be no doubt that this was the real substratum of his religious consciousness. He gives a clear manifestation of this religious disposition of his mind, when he characterises the efforts of his antagonists as nothing but a tyranny hostile to God.² In conflict with him, the friend of Christians and of Christianity, they had to rely solely on what still remained of the power of heathenism, and thus they set themselves against the spirit of the age. They were the enemies and adversaries of

¹ Here I am in essential agreement, though on quite independent grounds, with Burckhardt's estimate of Constantine, *op. cit.*, p. 346 *sq.*, 389 *sq.* As for Eusebius, I cannot but agree with Burckhardt that in everything relating to Constantine he is a very untrustworthy panegyrist, and is guided by the Christian hierarchical interest.

² Thus, in Euseb. *Vita Const.* iii. 12, he speaks of a *θεομαχία τυράννων*.

God, because they fought against a cause which history plainly showed to be the declared will of God; and they were tyrants, since, from this same reason, they were without any justification for their power and rule. It was therefore a perfectly idle and futile attempt that Licinius made, when for the last time he held up the standard of paganism; he did so at a time when it had long been clear that the chance of battle could fall in no other way than it did.

Thus, harsh and repellent as the relations of Christianity to the Roman State were at the beginning, and sharp as the antithesis was which they could not but present to each other, now at last they came together peacefully and harmoniously to the most intimate unity. Christianity and the Roman State now travel hand in hand on the way of the historical development which still lies before them, and it seems as if no force in the world could again sunder the two powers so closely united with each other. But what enabled Christianity to gain a victory which men of every age have felt that they could not but regard as one of the greatest wonders of the world's history? The cause lay, first of all, in the definiteness and the traditional significance of the forms by which Christianity united its adherents to the most intimate communion among themselves. No religion can attain to historical importance without a form of association resting on an authority that has been long recognised. Faith in Jesus as the Messiah who had appeared and was to come again in the next times, was a characteristic enough bond of association for those who believed in him. The more intimately it united them among themselves, the more decided was the contrast it caused them to present to the whole world by which they were surrounded. They had but two alternatives before them, either they must conquer the world or they must perish in the struggle with it. After the christological consciousness of the Christian churches had been so far developed, that Christ could not be thought of as the head of the Church in his divine dignity without the churches having at their head an overseer and president representing him, the episcopate became the

form of the association of the Church. On the one side, this institution was capable of endless development, while, on the other, it was calculated to unite all its members together in the closest possible way; and it both went back into the past, and reached forward to the future. It may with truth be asserted that it was the episcopate alone that rendered possible the historical development of Christianity, and prepared its way to a world-historical future. This it did because it united in itself things divine and things human, things spiritual and things worldly, the high and the lowly, the near and the distant; and while by no means closed to what was transcendental in the Christian consciousness, did not fail, on the other side, to recognise the facts given in real life and the needs of the present. So often as an important crisis was reached in the history of the development of Christianity, so often did it prove that the episcopate came forward to effect the needed conciliation. It was the episcopate which cleared away the dangers and perversions even of Gnosticism and Montanism, which cut off the extremes of all the heresies, and provided for the Catholic Church in an increasing measure that assured and even basis which it required for an existence calculated to endure in the future. And without doubt it was the bishops who, when the heaviest blow of the last persecutions had not without good reason been aimed persistently at their heads, mainly contributed to the guidance of the Christian Church and of the Roman State through the transition to the new form of their relations to each other. But, we are obliged to ask again, what was it that made it so great a need for Christianity to have such forms as would enable it to embrace a wider and wider area, what was the inner in this outer form? The simple answer to this question appears to lie in the impressions and results which Christianity cannot but produce in all susceptible minds. And yet regarding these history has very little to tell us. How many were converted to faith in Christ by the comfort of the Gospel and all the spiritual blessings it conveys, this is recorded in no annals of history, but belongs entirely to the secret history of the human heart, from which scarcely even a faint report is carried

into that general history which passes over individuals so lightly and rapidly. Nor indeed, from the very nature of the case, could these, whatever we may say of them, belong to the first and most obvious effects produced by Christianity in its contact with the heathen world. Forgiveness of sins, reconciliation, comfort and peace of conscience, these every religion gives in its own way, nor could all this be found wanting in the heathen religions, if only one believed in the gods, whose gift these highest blessings of the spiritual life would be found to be. As soon indeed as faith in the gods themselves had disappeared, the indispensable condition had been lost for receiving all that could be looked for as their gift. And for this reason the main question at issue in the struggle between Christianity and heathenism lay, not on the side of the heart anxious for salvation, thirsting for the consolation of the Gospel, but rather on the side of the reason, asking above all as to the truth of its ideas. The one great and pressing point to be settled was as to the truth and meaning which polytheism, the belief in the gods of the heathen religion, might still possess for the religious consciousness. Regarding from this point of view the relation of Christianity to the heathen world confronting it, and the great result of the first three centuries of Christianity, how little can we wonder that it gained at this time so general and so decided a victory over that heathen world? How many would there be at this time whose imagination the old mythical doctrine of the gods still influenced with its magic charm? In the early days of the empire even a religion so repugnant to all heathen notions as the Jewish made a great number of proselytes, and this may surely teach us how easily the religious consciousness of the heathen turned away from his old gods. And if we consider further with how pronounced and energetic an opposition Christianity confronted the whole system of heathen polytheism, and how, in all the conflicts which were waged between Christianity and heathenism, the main point was that of acknowledging or denying the heathen gods,¹ we cannot be surprised at the result

¹ Compare a refutation of the heathen belief in the gods in Tert. Apol. c. 10 sq.

that the victory did not remain much longer undecided. For who were those among whom the old faith still had its most active defenders? On the one side the coarse fanatical populace, with whom this faith had turned into the most utter superstition, and blind hatred against the Christians was the one acting motive; on the other side was the small class of those who were led from reasons of State-interest to wish this religion maintained, or who more or less unconsciously foisted into it another meaning, in the light of their Platonic idealism. But between these two classes there was the very considerable middle class, the numerous members of which belonged neither to the political grandees nor to the philosophical illuminati, nor yet to the lowest class of the people, but composed the ordinary citizen-class, of more or less cultivation. Of this class were those people of whom, as Christians, Celsus and Lucian speak with such contempt, those artisans, those weavers, shoemakers, and tanners, who knew so little how to come forward publicly, but proved so active in the matters of their faith in secret and by themselves. It was in the purer and less prepossessed mind of this class that Christianity had found from the beginning the most receptive soil for its operations, inasmuch as they were the least restrained by all the prejudices and interests of the other classes from finally dissolving in their sober practical reason the weak bond still holding them to the faith in the old gods. If people of this class had little opportunity, especially in the political circumstances of that period, to play any part upon the stage of public life, it was the more probable that Christianity would make greater and greater progress among them privately, and on an increasing scale withdraw from the faith in the old gods the ground of its existence. Thus at last the time arrived when in the midst of the heathen population a new generation had arisen, the existence of which all at once opened the eyes of the heathen potentates to the abyss on the brink of which the heathen State was standing. The words of Tertullian, in which he describes the strength which the Christian population had even in his day attained, are not perhaps to be taken literally; some deduction

may be made on account of a rhetorical mode of statement. Yet, for all this, they are sufficient to enable us to estimate the importance which Christianity had acquired even in his day in the provinces of the Roman Empire. Hesterni sumus, the inspired apologist of Christianity exclaims to the heathen, *et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum; sola vobis reliquimus templa. Cui bello non idonei, non prompti fuissetus, etiam impares copiis, qui tam libenter trucidamur, si non apud ipsam disciplinam magis occidi liceret, quam occidere. Potuimus et inermes, nec rebelles, sed tantummodo discordes solius divortii invidia adversus vos dimicasse. Si enim, tanta vis hominum, in aliquem orbis remoti sinum abruptissemus a vobis, suffudisset utique dominationem vestram tot qualiumcunque civium amissio, immo etiam et ipsa destitutione punisset. Procul dubio expavissetis ad solitudinem vestram, ad silentium rerum et stuporem quendam quasi mortui orbis. Quaesissetis, quibus imperaretis. Plures hostes quam cives vobis remansissent. Nunc enim pauciores hostes habetis prae multitudine Christianorum paene omnium civitatum, pene omnes cives Christianos habendo, sed hostes maluistis vocare generis humani potius quam erroris humani.*¹

And now let it be considered how much this state of affairs must have increased in the course of a century, after so long a period of repose, and such ineffectual persecutions. What the Emperor Maximin, the last vehement persecutor of the Christians, said in his edict issued to put a stop to hostilities in the year 312, was certainly quite in accordance with the truth, that the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian had seen that almost all men had left the worship of the gods and mixed themselves up with the people of the Christians.² The ground of the old religion had long been undermined in all directions, when Constantine followed the impulse of the time which carried him, and placed by it on its summit, erected on the place deserted by the old gods the symbol of the cross.

¹ Tert. Apol. c. 37.

² Euseb. E. H. ix. 9. An ἔθνος Χριστιανῶν is spoken of here, as a Corpus Christianorum in the edict of the year 311.

PART SIXTH.

CHRISTIANITY AS A MORAL RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE IN ITS ABSOLUTENESS AND ITS LIMITATION IN TIME.

THUS the word with which the founder of Christianity began the preaching of the Gospel, that the confessors of his doctrine are not only the poor in spirit, whose is the kingdom of heaven, but also the meek who shall inherit the earth, was fulfilled in this last particular also, and proved true by the external history of Christianity in the first three centuries in which it was a part of the history of the world. The thoughtful historian, when he fixes the point at which Christianity stands in the great epoch of its fortunes which is marked by Constantine, cannot but look back to the beginning and to the principle from which all those phenomena proceeded which are contained in the history of the first three centuries. That sense of poverty, the feeling in which the first adherents of Jesus confronted the world and looked on themselves as the poor, but the poor in spirit whose outward physical poverty was but the symbol and the earnest of that which they possessed in thinking of the kingdom of heaven, the very opposite of poverty, stands before us here in the whole power of an all-commanding, world-conquering principle. To nothing but its principle, the power working within it, is Christianity indebted for all that it has grown to be externally in the course of time. And the greater the effects which have flowed from this principle, the more certainly do they authenticate it as proceeding from a divine origin. There are more ways than one of defining this divine element in the origin and the principle of Christianity. We may speak of the

Son of God incarnate in humanity, or of the spirit poured out upon the first community of believers in Jesus, or of the spirit in the sense of the apostle Paul, whom we find identifying the divine Spirit which works in believers with the immediate self-consciousness of the Christians in such a way that we can only conceive of it as the principle of the Christian consciousness. But in any case, when the principle is compared with its effects it can only be considered as one essentially moral in its character. The only way in which any religion can prove the divinity of its origin and principle is by the moral effect which it produces, by the moral power and energy which it calls forth in its adherents. Now undoubtedly there has never been a greater and more penetrating change of the world, one that has more distinctly made an epoch both in respect of its extent outwardly and of its inner significance, than that which came to pass through Christianity. But what would the change that took place in the religious faith and the ideas of mankind amount to, without a corresponding moral change? Of what profit would it have been that the world turned from polytheism to monotheism, and instead of setting its hopes upon a Messiah still to come in the future, believed in one already come, and worshipped in him the Son of God in the highest sense, had not the world become another world in its moral disposition and its moral conduct, and had not those phenomena in which the immorality of the ancient world is so characteristically manifested been displaced by genuinely moral virtue and religion? Christianity itself defines the work which it designs to do in man, describes the essence of the change it aims at producing in him, as a regeneration and renewal of the whole man. If this be so, then this power which re-forms man must prove itself historically by a moral regeneration brought about in the public life of humanity. And in fact it is just this that gives the period of the first three centuries of Christianity, regarded from the most universal point of view, that of morals and religion, its greatest importance.

What we have here to consider is not what Christianity brought to pass in particular individuals, in the hidden depths of their

inner life, but its effects on a large scale, what appeared as the noblest fruit of its influence in the common public life of the nations. And looking at the subject in this way we have every right to say that the world actually became through Christianity a morally purer and better world. This applies of course only to the limited circle to which the influence of Christianity directly extended. But the change appears, as from the nature of the case we should expect, in all those points at which Christianity was brought into near and immediate contact with the prevailing moral corruption of the heathen world, and is here an undeniable historical fact. The heathen adversaries of Christianity refused to allow to it even the credit of being a moral religion, and went so far as to accuse it of the deepest moral perversity and profligacy. The answer of the Christians to these accusations was simply to point to those phenomena, patent to all, in which the life of the Christians exhibited a genuinely moral character. Let any one read the writings of the Christian apologists of the second century, and judge whether they could have ventured to come forward with such speeches to defend and to describe Christianity, had they not been speaking the truth. If the facts had been quite otherwise—if that simple unfeigned piety and fear of God, that shrinking from everything immoral and forbidden in which was expressed the constant sense of the presence of a God who sees in secret and judges according to strict righteousness, that uprightness, faithfulness, and straightforwardness in all the relations of social life, that chastity, and that purity of manners which turned away from all sensual delights, that hearty self-sacrificing benevolence from which not even enemies and injurers were shut out, that devoted and ever constant patience which displayed in sufferings, as if they were the true calling of the Christian, the highest exercise of moral qualities, and all those virtues which have at all times been regarded as the fairest fruits and the most certain evidence of the truly Christian mind,—if these characteristics had not actually and most unmistakably distinguished the Christian community from the heathen world, then the apologists could not have used

the language they did.¹ And what made the difference all the more noticeable was that in many things peculiarly entering into the life of the ancient world the Christians took no part, for the simple reason that they could not combine it with their Christian notions. Not only did they avoid everything that could bring them into contact with the heathen demon-worship, but they also kept away from places where they could not appear without partaking in the idle search for pleasure, the coarse delight in spectacles, the shameless licentiousness of heathen manners. On this point we need only consider how, for example, Tertullian, not here under the influence of his Montanistic rigour, judges as to participation in the heathen spectacles. God, he says, has enjoined upon us to deal with the Holy Spirit, since he is in his own nature tender and soft, with calmness and gentleness, peace and quiet, and not to agitate him by rage or ill-nature or anger or grief. How then can he accord with the spectacles? Every spectacle is not without strong agitation of spirit. They are likewise commanded to keep all immodesty far from them. On this ground they are excluded from the theatre, where immodesty has taken up its abode, and nothing is in repute but what is disreputable

¹ Compare particularly such passages as Justin, *Apol. i. cap. 12 sq.* Athenagoras, *Leg.*, cap. 31 *sq.* Tertullian, *Apol.*, cap. 39 *sq.* The Christians examined by Pliny also appealed, in proof of the blamelessness of the Christian life, to the fact that *se sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati denegarent* (comp. 1 Pet. iv. 15). On the honour and conscientiousness of the Christians in the payment of their taxes to the State, also insisted on by Justin, *Apol. i. cap. 17*, Tertullian says, *Apol. cap. 42*, *Vectigalia gratias Christianis agent ex fide dependentibus debitum, qua alieno fraudando abstinemus, ut, si ineatur, quantum vectigalibus pereat fraude et mendacio vestrarum professionum, facile ratio haberi possit, unius speciei querela compensata pro commodo ceterarum rationum.* (What the State loses by the Christians not taking part in the heathen sacrificial worship is sufficiently made up by their honesty in other matters.) There is scarcely any finer evidence to the truly moral spirit with which Christianity confronted the heathen world, than that contained in Tertullian's *De Patientia*. Compare especially the conclusion, cap. 15, where Tertullian sums up the qualities with which patience is described as the soul of practical Christianity, and where he contrasts the truly Christian heavenly patience with the *falsa probrosa patientia gentium terrae*.

elsewhere. What it is wrong to say, it is also wrong to hear. Very decidedly does Tertullian reject the false reasons by which Christians endeavoured to show the justifiableness of such pleasures; appealing, for example, to the fact that they were nowhere expressly forbidden in Scripture. Never and in no place can that be excused which God condemns, never and in no place can that be allowed which is always and everywhere forbidden. It is required by pure truth and the fear of God, which ever remains the same, that we should not change our judgment according to circumstances. What is truly good or evil can never be anything else. In God's truth everything stands sure. The heathen who have not the complete truth, because they have not God for the teacher of truth, explain good and evil according to their own will and pleasure; what is counted good in one place is counted bad in another, and what is called bad in one place is called good in another. Everything is of the devil that is not of God, or that displeases God. All this belongs to the pomp of the devil, which we renounce in the symbol of our faith. But what we have once renounced by an oath, therein we are no longer free to take part either by word or act or look. Do we not rescind our oath when we sin against that which we testified in it? Shall we ask an answer from the heathens themselves? Let them declare to us if it is permissible for a Christian to be present at a spectacle. It is just in this that they recognise that a man has become a Christian, that he renounces the spectacles. God keep far from his own so great a desire for a pernicious pleasure!¹ We see at once how principles like these must have found their application in many directions besides, where the Christians came in contact with the public life of the ancient world, and how earnest and severe a character they must have given to the view the Christians took of life, and to their whole behaviour.² If, from there being

¹ *De spectac. cap. 15 sqq.*

² Here we have to mention two writings of Tertullian, *De habitu muliebri* and *de cultu feminarum* (or the two books *de cultu feminarum*), in which, here also without being specially influenced by Montanist principles, he exhorts Christian

so many things in it in which they could not take part without injuring and denying their moral convictions, they were kept at a distance from the heathen world, it necessarily followed that they fell out of relations with the public and political life of that ancient world. It was thus involved in the circumstances in which they were placed, that as they retired from public life, they formed a closer community among themselves. But the opinion formed of them by some was altogether unjust, that their union was a purely political association. The reason why aims of such a character were imputed to them was, that the religious and moral bond which united them lay entirely outside of the sphere of vision of the heathen world. In fairness, Tertullian says,¹ this sect should be counted among the tolerated associations, since none of those things is done by it which are generally dreaded at the hands of forbidden associations. "We, who are cold to all ambition, have no motive for political associations; nothing is more out of our way than politics. We look upon the world as the common state for all." Yet this retirement, necessitated by the very nature of the case, from the public and political life of the heathen world, was by no means to be construed into an admission on the part of the Christians that they had no wish to be of service for the practical aims of society apart from politics.² "How," Tertullian urges on the heathens who took this view of the life of the Christians,

women to distinguish themselves from the heathen women by the sobriety and dignity of their dress as well as in other ways. "What cause have you," he says, in the latter work, cap. 11, "to appear in public with great finery, removed as you are from the occasions which call for such exhibitions? You do not visit the temples, nor demand public shows, nor do you know the festivals of the heathens. It is for those gatherings to see and to be seen that all that finery is exhibited. But you have none but serious causes for appearing in public. A difference ought to be showed between God's handmaids and the handmaids of Satan, that you may serve as an example to them." The *Paedagogus* of Clement of Alexandria gives in the second and third books a great variety of directions for the moral conduct of Christians, only they go too much into particulars and petty details.

¹ *Apol.* cap. 38.

² They would not allow themselves, Tertullian says in his *Apology*, cap. 42, to be called *infructuosi in negotiis*.

“can this be asserted of men who live with you, and share with you the same food and clothing, the same requirements of life? For we are no Brahmans or Gymnosophists of the Indias, no denizens of the woods who flee from the world. We are very mindful of the thanks we owe to God the Lord, as the Creator. We reject no enjoyment of his gifts; we only keep our enjoyment of them moderate, and are careful not to abuse them. Hence we inhabit this world along with you, not without sharing with you markets and fairs, baths and workshops, and the rest of the commerce of life. We carry on along with you navigation and military service, agriculture and commerce. We share your trade with you, and contribute our labour also for your use.” Thus a new community was being founded in the midst of the heathen world—a community resting on a genuinely moral basis, and contrasting the more with the life of the heathen world the more the heathens were wanting in those elements of life in which men are connected with each other by moral bonds, by love and a brotherly disposition. “Especially are you jealous,” Tertullian says, in this connection,¹ “of what love brings to pass among us. Behold, it is said, how they love one another! This must indeed appear striking to them, for they hate one another. And how they are ready to die for one another! Yes, for they, on the contrary, are ready rather to murder one another. And that we call one another brethren sounds suspiciously to them, for no other reason than that with them all names of consanguinity are assumed in mere pretence of affection. We are your brothers also, according to the law of that common nature which is the author of us all, though you as unkind brothers deny that human nature. But much more fittingly are those called and counted brothers who have been led to the knowledge of the one God as their Father, who have received one spirit of holiness, who have awakened out of the same darkness of ignorance into the light of the same truth. And we, who are bound together in mind and soul, do not hesitate to share our earthly goods with one another. With us all

¹ Apol. cap. 39.

things are common, only there we do not allow the principle of community, where it is generally practised by other men." Tertullian is here referring to married life among the Christians. In connection with marriage and the life of the family, it was to be expected that the moral spirit which inspired the community of the Christians would peculiarly manifest its ennobling influence. The greater the value the Christians attached to chastity and moral self-discipline, the more sacredness would the bond of marriage have in their eyes. Marriage itself was regarded as a thing religious, and it early became customary to form the bond of marriage not without the sanction of religion and the blessing of the Church.¹ How deep and tender is the feeling with regard to the importance of marriage expressed in the following description of Tertullian: — "How can I set forth the happiness of a marriage which the Church approves, which the oblation confirms, the sealing of which is announced by angels, which the Father holds for ratified? Even on earth sons do not rightly and lawfully wed without their fathers' consent. What kind of yoke is that of two believers, of one hope, one conversation, the same service? Both are brethren; both are fellow-servants; there is no difference of spirit or of flesh; they are truly two in one flesh. Where there is one flesh there is also one spirit; they pray together, fast together, lead and admonish one another. They are together in the church of God, in sorrow and in joy; neither conceals anything from the other; neither is troublesome to the other. With freedom the sick is visited and the needy supported. Psalms and hymns echo between the two, and they emulate one another which shall sing better to the Lord. Christ rejoices when he sees and hears such things; to such he sends his own peace. Where two are there he is also, and where

¹ Tert. de Monog. c. 11: Ut — in Deo nubas secundum legem et apostolum — qualis es id matrimonium postulans — ab episcopo monogamo a presbyteris et diaconis ejusdem sacramenti — ? — Conjungent vos in ecclesia virgine, unius Christi unica sponsa. (In this passage Tertullian is speaking against second marriage.) De Pudic. c. 4: Penes nos occultae quoque conjunctiones, id est, non prius apud ecclesiam professae, juxta moechiam et fornicationem judicari periclitantur: Ad Uxorem 2. 9 he exalts the happiness ejus matrimonii, quod ecclesia conciliat, et confirmat oblatio et obsignatum angeli renunciant, pater rato habet.

he is there the evil one cannot come.”¹ The description of a marriage like this evidently borrows many of its traits from the ideal, yet it is clear that only the moral spirit of Christianity had the power to give birth to such an ideal. Here we notice a further point. Such intimate wedded intercourse as Tertullian speaks of is possible only on the basis that both the parties have equal rights. Thus it is an essential feature of the notion of marriage to which Christianity gave rise, that the woman stands in a much freer and more independent relation to the man than was generally the case in the ancient world. It was required by the Christian notion of marriage that the woman was raised above the servile position she had hitherto occupied. But this emancipation of woman was a thing which Christianity at once and of necessity brought about. In the freedom of the Christian consciousness women at once felt themselves free from everything that was inconsistent with it; and in the mixed marriages which were so frequent in that age, there was abundant opportunity to become conscious of this freedom. Even the apostle Paul allowed that the Christian wife of a mixed marriage had the right of free and independent action in relation to her husband in matters of religion.² If this was so, the wife could not fail to become conscious that she was entitled to a freer position in social life generally. The freer conduct which even the women of the Corinthian Church allowed themselves—more particularly if they claimed the same privileges for themselves in the meetings of the Church which the men exercised—shows us how early Christian women came to

¹ *Ad Uxorem*, ii. 9. The two books *Ad Uxorem* belong to the pre-Montanist period of Tertullian. Compare Neander, *Antignosticus*, Bohn, p. 350 *sq.* It is self-evident that such a marriage can only take place between a Christian husband and a Christian wife. Tertullian accordingly argues seriously and powerfully against mixed marriages:—*Ad Uxorem*, ii. 3: *Fideles gentilium matrimonia subeuntes stupri reos esse constat, et arcendos ab omni communicatione fraternitatis*,—comp. *De Corona*, c. 13. The arguments on which Tertullian bases his opinion against second marriage, hard and stern as they are, yet express that genuinely moral spirit in which his view of the nature of Christian marriage was conceived.

² *1 Cor.* vii. 12, 13. The wife has the same right to ἀφιέναι as the husband: ἡ γυνή, ἥτις ἐχει ἄνδρα ἄπιστον—μὴ ἀφιέτω αὐτόν.

feel this consciousness of their freer position. It is true that the apostle Paul felt it to be necessary to restrain their desire for freedom, and to remind them of the duty of subjection to their husbands;¹ yet there can be no doubt that the moral notion of Christian marriage was most essentially determined by the freer position which Christianity gave to women as nothing before could ever have done, in the consciousness of their religious liberty.

If marriage is the basis of household life, the new consecration which Christianity gave to this institution must naturally have acted upon the whole life of the household, penetrating it with a new spirit. But apart from this, the moral influence of Christianity could find no sphere of action more suitable or more intimately corresponding to its own nature than that provided by the life of the household. The repulsion which the Christians felt for the manners or the immorality of heathen life produced the very natural result of directing their gaze from what was without to what was within, and sending them to the inner life of their own community to seek that satisfaction which the public life of the surrounding world was not able to give them. In addition to this, a religion like Christianity, which inculcates turning away from the world and turning into one's own heart, which encourages the practice of earnest self-contemplation and self-knowledge, and regards constant occupation with the most secret matters of a heart directed towards God as the most important duty—such a religion necessarily operated in the direction of awakening a taste for domestic life, the quiet, sacred circle where alone many of those virtues which make the business of the Christian life can be practised and fostered. Here we notice a peculiarly characteristic feature of that social tendency to which Christianity gave an impulse. The predominating tendency of the life of the ancient world was towards the outward, the public, the political. Christianity, on the contrary, impressed on social life the directly opposite bias—to retire into itself, and to give to private and personal

¹ Compare my *Beitrag zur Erklärung der Korintherbriefe*. Theol. Jahrb. 1852, p. 563 *sq.*

affairs a deep importance such as they could never have attained in the prime and the glory of the old civic life. The decisive change in this direction came, as might have been expected, at the period when Christianity and heathenism were most sharply antithetical and repellent to each other. It is more than a hypothesis if we affirm that the influence exercised by Christianity in the quiet power of its family and wedded life, was the principal agent in bringing about the great change by which the aristocratic and despotic spirit of the ancient world—which regarded the individual as merely a mean for the general ends of the whole—was brought to yield to a more humane and kindly way of thinking, in which the equal rights of all were recognised, and regard paid to the human dignity even of the weakest and the lowest.¹

In all these particulars that genuinely moral spirit of Christianity declares itself, which is the inmost principle of its historical development. That spirit manifests itself much more characteristically in the homely matters we have been discussing than in that

¹ It is from this point of view that we have to regard the slavery of the ancient world. The mitigation and gradual abolition of slavery, though not a thing unthought of by the humaner minds of antiquity (compare my *Abhandlung über Seneca und Paulus in der Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theol.*, 1858, p. 212 *sq.*, also in the *Drei Abhandlungen*, No. 3, p. 423 *sq.*), yet dates from the time of Christianity. The apostle Paul, in the conviction that a man could be a good Christian in any rank of life, advises the slave (1 Cor. vii. 21), even if he be able to gain his liberty, rather to remain as he is. In his fundamental Christian view, however, as expressed in Gal. iii. 28, the difference between slave and freeman is made to disappear; and if there was no inner reason for the subsistence of the difference, it was found, sooner or later, to fall away outwardly as well. What a kindly spirit towards slaves breathes in the Epistle to Philemon, where the slave converted to Christianity is sent back to his Christian master as a Christian brother, and with all the sentiments of Christian sympathy. Origen (c. Cels. iii. 54), regards the training of slaves to a freer mind as one of the exercises of humanity with which Christianity is charged, inasmuch as it seeks to heal all reasonable natures with its reasonable doctrines, and to make them the friends of God, the Creator of all. One of the innovations with which the Roman Calistinus is charged by his adversary, Hippolytus, is an ordinance by which marriages between slaves and free women were to be allowed and to be recognised as legally valid. Philos. ix. 12. p. 291. Comp. Döllinger, *op. cit.* p. 158 *sq.* According to Möhler, *Bruchstücke aus der Geschichte der Aufhebung der Sklaverei* (*Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze*, vol. ii. 1840, p. 54 *sq.*), Chrysostom was the first to raise the subject of the emancipation of the slaves in the Christian Church.

feature of the history of early Christianity which is commonly most admired. The latter indeed, if we analyse with some exactness the exaggerated representations of vainglorious writers, or the motives, not always of the purest, from which it proceeded, often proves to be a mere deceptive show. Whatever glories surround the Christian martyr-heroism, the true and solid substance of them is ultimately to be found in that moral earnestness alone, which Christianity awakened in its adherents. By this earnestness it produced much deeper and more permanent effects upon human life, than by anything that remained after the transitory glory of the martyr-crowns. But with regard to our whole subject we are not entitled to dwell only on the bright side which we have before us in the phenomena on which we have been dwelling; there is also a dark side confronting it, and this must be considered as well if we are to have a true and faithful representation of the moral and religious life of the Christians of our period.

Moral qualities and acts are pure and noble in proportion as the religious consciousness from which they set out is free and uncorrupted. What essentially determined the morality of the Christian was that in his religious consciousness he had made himself free from all those elements which in heathen polytheism clouded the moral consciousness and hindered its pure and free development. But in this respect were the Christians really so free in their religious consciousness as the decided antithesis which they presented to heathen polytheism would lead us to believe? True, they did not believe in the existence of the heathen gods, but instead of gods they felt themselves encountered everywhere in the heathen world by demons; and the idea of these demons exercised the widest influence on their lives. The Christian belief in demons engendered a multitude of superstitious ideas and actions, by which the life of the Christians itself received a heathen impress. In every place, and especially where he came in contact with the heathen world, the Christian saw himself surrounded and laid wait for by demons, against whose hostile attacks and snares he could not be too much on his guard. This

produced in his whole bearing a timid anxiety, a preoccupation and disquiet which could not but be very injurious to his moral attitude, and was far from being any great testimony to the firmness and cheerfulness of his moral and religious self-consciousness. And not only so, but in this constant battle with the demons he resorted, since he thought there were no other means of protection against those beings, to practices resting on no moral ground, and in fact belonging to no art but magic. What is it but magic, when the power to drive out demons was ascribed to the mere name of Jesus?¹ With prayer also, although the Christians were well acquainted with its moral and religious efficacy and importance, magical ideas of the same sort were not seldom associated. And what could be more natural, than that, in proportion as the demon-world everywhere made itself felt, human life and the human soul should stand entirely unprotected and open to the influence of higher powers of opposite nature? But the more the centre of gravity of the consciousness comes to be not in the man himself, but outside of him, not in the sensible but in the super-sensible world, the more is his moral consciousness deprived of its firm and immanent principle. Nor was the belief in demons less disturbing and disquieting for the Christian consciousness on that side where the demonic in the form of heathenism encountered it in the daily relations of life. In the manifold relations in which the Christian stood to the heathen world, it was hard enough for him to avoid every occasion through which his conscience might become burdened with the guilt of favouring polytheism. But how many collisions were certain to arise when the further step was taken that every contact with heathenism was counted as a demonic pollution, and how hard was it to draw the line between what was allowed and what was interdicted, when the life of the Christians was so interwoven with that of the heathens that the question of conscience might easily become a question of life or death.

¹ As even by Origen, *contra Cels.* i. 25. *Τῆς δ' ὁμοίας ἔχεται περὶ ὀνομάτων φιλοσοφίας καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος Ἰησοῦς, οὗ τὸ ὄνομα μυρίου ἤδη ἐναργῶς ἐώραται δαίμονας ἐξελεύσαν ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων, ἐνεργήσαν εἰς ἐκείνους ἀφ' ὧν ἀπηλύθησαν.*

Tertullian declares that not only he is an idolater who strews incense to the gods, or sacrifices or performs any other act directly connected with the heathen cultus; but that all acts, trades, and businesses, which contribute in any way to the erection or adornment of idols, are to be placed under the same category of idolatry. What then were those to do who made their living by such an occupation? To this question Tertullian gives the stern reply, that faith fears not hunger, but knows that for God's sake it must despise hunger, as well as all other modes of death. The apostles also gave up their trades and occupations for the call of the Lord, and none of those whom the Lord called to himself said, I know not whereby I am to live.¹ This moral rigorism was based for the most part on the false view of the heathen gods, as wicked demons hostile to God. But that simply shows us how limited and one-sided the moral action must have been which proceeded from such views; and since it was surely impossible that everything alike could be regarded as a furthering of heathen idolatry, how constantly the doubt must have obtruded itself whether the action thus enjoined, and involving so great a sacrifice, had so strong a claim upon the moral consciousness as was supposed. As against such scruples Tertullian reminds his readers that the display and luxury of the age provided occupation for the arts even more than its superstition;² but what was there to prevent the same rigorism from extending yet further, since there could everywhere be found in one way or another, some indirect reference to heathen idolatry and the *pompa diaboli*? Tertullian even went so far as to declare the office of the *Ludimagistri* and the other *professores literarum* to be incompatible with Christianity; they also stand in the most manifold relation to idolatry: they have to describe the heathen gods, and to explain their names, genealogies, the fables about them, and all that belongs to their honour and personal distinction. Here he cannot help noticing the objection that if it is wrong to teach such things, it must be wrong to learn them as well, and that in this case the Christians would be

¹ *De Idolol. c. 11 sq.*² *Op. cit. cap. 8.*

deprived of the means of general culture, which is indispensable to them even with a view to religion. The only reply he has to give to this is that there is nevertheless a difference between teaching and learning, and that the compulsion to take part in heathen idolatry is not nearly so great in the case of the pupils as in that of the teachers.¹ But this only shows us to what perpetual collisions such a limited mode of view could not fail to give rise, and that there was ultimately no way of dealing with these collisions, but that of petty evasions. In the same category we have to place all those cases in which the Christians came in conflict with the heathen state. How could the Christian fill any office of the magistracy, if heathen usages and insignia were connected with it? how could he undertake military service if he had to swear the heathen oath of the standards? how could he obey the emperor, if the emperor stood at the head of a heathen state? Tertullian was nothing more than logical, when to the first two of these questions he returned a stern uncompromising negative,² but what course was to be followed in answering the third? The Christians honoured the emperor, and showed him due obedience, recognising it as their duty not only to give to God the things that are God's, but also to give to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. Indeed they even saw in the emperor, the regent placed by God at the summit of the empire which was to subsist to the end of the world, the man who stood nearest to God.³ But if the whole

¹ Cap. 10. The question, afterwards so frequently discussed, of the secularia studia, is here spoken of for the first time. The same question, but in another sense, is discussed by Clement of Alexandria, Strom. i. 5 sq., with reference to the παιδεία κοσμική or the προπαιδεία ελληνική.

² *Op. cit.* cap. 18 sq. Daemonia sunt magistratus seculi hujus, unius collegii insignia fasces et purpuras gestant (dignitates et potestates).—Non convenit sacramento divino et humano, signo Christi et signo diaboli, castris lucis et castris tenebrarum; non potest una anima duobus deberi, Deo et Caesari. The same question is answered by Origen, c. Celsum, viii. 73 sq.; but he does not enter into the real point involved in it.

³ Tert. ad Scap. c. 2. Christianus nullius est hostis, nedum imperatoris, quem sciens a Deo suo constitui necesse est ut et ipsum diligat et revereatur et honoret, et salvum velit cum toto Romano imperio, quousque seculum stabit, tamdiu enim stabit. Colimus ergo et imperatorem sic, quomodo et nobis licet et ipsi expedit, ut hominem a Deo secundum et quidquid est a Deo consecutum, solo Deo

constitution of the state was founded on the worship of demons, and the head of the state was himself the most powerful supporter and the greatest furtherer of this cultus, the Christian view could as easily see in him the vicegerent of the devil, as the regent appointed by God.¹ It is true the Christians felt it necessary to make their obedience to the magistrate dependent on the condition that he did not make a duty to them of anything unchristian. But how soon would the limit of their obedience be reached, if the emperor himself should require of them anything heathen or demonic, and in such a case what choice remained to them, but either to injure their consciences as Christians, or to go out of a world, in which there was no practical possibility of the exercise of Christian virtue except on the condition of a temporary immolation of the moral subject?² A moral disposition which decides without hesitation for the latter alternative is highly to be esteemed from the subjective point of view; but within what narrow limits is a course of moral action confined which is determined by ideas belonging to such a limited view of things and standing in so fortuitous a connection with Christianity? For considering the very idea which did more than any other to bring the Christians into such strained relations with the Roman State, how little inner justification does it find in the essence of Christianity itself?

minoren. Hoc et ipse volet. Sic enim omnibus major est, dum solo vero Deo minor est: sic et ipsis Diis major est, dum et ipsi in potestate sunt ejus.

¹ In the Apocalypse Nero as Antichrist was this. There could be no greater contrast than that which obtains on this point between the Apocalypse and the Epistle to the Romans, xiii. 1 *sq.* It is with reference to the same Nero, in whose person the apocalyptic writer sees the embodiment of Antichrist, that the Apostle speaks of the Christian duty of obedience to the magistrate; and where the former writer exhorts to the most determined resistance to the adversary, who is the enemy of God and is contending with the Lamb, the dictum of the latter is, *ὁ ἀντιπασόμενος τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ διαταγῇ ἀνθέστηκεν*, etc. The dilemma which could not but arise for the early Christians from this difference between the Pauline and the Johannine injunction, has been solved by time in the simple discovery that Nero was not the Antichrist the Apocalypse announced that he was. But what a stumbling-block must it have been for the conscience of that age!

² De Idolol. cap. 24. *Nemo dicat: quis tam tuto praecebebit? excundum de seculo erit. Quasi non tanti sit exire, quam idololatrem in seculo stare!*

The moral and religious business of life for the Christian was from the first defined (Eph. vi. 12) in this way, that the Christian had to fight not only with flesh and blood, but also with the powers of darkness. How the Christian bore himself as against the demons and demonic heathenism, we see from the traits to which we have drawn attention as illustrating the character of the Christian morality. But in his own flesh also the Christian saw himself placed in the sphere of an opposition by which his moral view of life and his moral action were determined in a peculiar way. The dualism of flesh and spirit, and in particular the second member of this antithesis, the flesh, occupied a most important place in the whole mode of view of the Christians. On the one side the flesh was precious and dear to them, and one of the principal distinctions between the Christian and the heathen view of the world and of life was with regard to it. Hence Celsus contemptuously called the Christians a race "clinging to the body," and in fact they were never able to give up the flesh, even though there dwelt in it the most dangerous enemy with whom they had to contend. They were under the necessity of seeking a reconciliation with the flesh in spite of these conflicts, since without the flesh there could be no resurrection, and without a resurrection there could be no enjoyment of all those goods and pleasures which the future world, the true home of the Christian, was to afford. In no other period of the Christian Church was so great stress laid on the doctrine of the resurrection against heathen and Gnostic adversaries, as in the first age. Several of the most notable of the Fathers, as especially Athenagoras and Tertullian, made it the subject of special discussion, and sought to bring out the importance and the truth of the doctrine, and to show that the body as well as the spirit was an essential element of the nature which God created, and of the human personality, so that it was impossible not to believe that the divine justice and mercy would extend to it also. And it was not only for the future world that the body had so great importance; in the present world as well it was necessary that it should, as if it were a separate subject, existing for itself, render its co-operation

throughout all the stages of the Christian economy, up to the attainment of the Christian salvation; its co-operation was so essential that salvation could not be obtained apart from its help, and it would receive in the future world, simply as its wages, what it had earned in the present.¹ This specifically Christian view of the flesh, however, is only one side of the way in which it is regarded. On the other side that dualism of spirit and matter, which was so intimately connected with the notions of antiquity, operated upon the Christian view of life in such a way as to make it appear that the highest requirement known to the Christian life as a business of moral progress was to flee from the body or to mortify the flesh. Christian morality thus acquired an essentially ascetic character, which however was simply the Christian modification of the tendency of mind prevailing generally in that age, to look upon philosophy on the side of its practical requirement as an *ἄσκησις*, a view which made philosophy appear to stand in an inner connection with Christianity. The task of asceticism is in general both to prevent the excess of the sensual lusts, and to set a limit to those material wants which are essentially necessary, by adopting a mode of life in which they are restricted to the smallest possible measure of the satisfaction they crave. And accordingly the frequent exercise of fasting was from the first a leading feature of Christian asceticism, the Christian character of these fasts appearing mainly in the fact of their being connected with the days and hours which were sacred to the memory of the passion and death of the Redeemer. These exercises, however, which were observed with more or less strictness, and in a freer or more precise form, do not present any remarkable feature though they were sometimes marked by special acts of abstinence. A much

¹ Comp. Tert. de resurr. carnis, c. 8. Videamus,—quanta huic substantiae frivola ac sordida apud Deum praerogativa sit—adeo caro salutis est cardo. De qua cum anima Deo allegitur, ipsa est, quae efficit, ut anima allegi possit. Scilicet caro abluatur, ut anima emaculetur; caro unguatur, ut anima consecretur; caro signatur, ut et anima muniatur; caro manus impositione adumbratur, ut et anima spiritu illuminetur; caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de Deo signetur. Non possunt ergo seperari in mercede, quas opera conjungit.

more important question is, What views were held by the Christians of the earliest period on marriage and celibacy? The phenomena bearing on this subject will give us more than anything else the standard by which to judge of the ascetic character of this period.

At no other time has the question of marriage ever been so much discussed, or have such widely divergent views been put forth on the subject.¹ On the dualistic view of the world, which

¹ On the occasion which leads the Apostle Paul to speak of marriage in 1 Cor. cap. vii., and on his view of marriage, compare my Beiträge zur Erklärung der Korintherbriefe, Theol. Jahrb. 1852, p. 1 *sq.* I can only repeat shortly here what I have there set forth in more detail. In his view of marriage the Apostle is still at that point of transition where the Christian moral view of the world has yet to disengage itself from the view of antiquity, which is based on the antithesis of matter and spirit. Not only does the Apostle accord the preference to celibacy viewed in itself, and allow marriage merely in order to prevent the greater evil of *πορνεία*,—he goes so far as to declare that it is best that those who are not yet married remain as they are. This is manifestly because he sees the catastrophe of the world, advancing to its dissolution, immediately impending, vii. 26, 29, 31. Accordingly it appears to him that at a time when everything is already shaking, changing, and passing away, it is scarcely worth the trouble to undertake a change of one's outward circumstances. In making the change a man can reckon on no permanency, and is only preparing care and trouble for himself, vv. 26, 28. Here it is very clear how such a standpoint bore upon the moral judgment to be formed on such relations of social life as marriage. From the point of the world's history at which we stand we cannot but see that from the beginning Christianity was destined to enter into all those relations in which it realises itself and has now set forth into the full reality of things seen the essential contents of its nature. What we thus observe we take to be the moral task of Christianity. Our whole view of its absolute value is essentially dependent on our observation of all that it has come to be to humanity in moral respects in the course of its historical development. The more profoundly and the more many-sidedly we see all the relations of moral and social life to be penetrated by it, the more certainly has the idea of its nature realised itself in that process. Thus should we find a standpoint from which the course of development which Christianity has followed lies beyond the sphere of vision, and not only so, but the very idea of such a development is cut off by the belief that the end of its course in time is at the door, when it is in truth only about to begin; we shall see it to be very natural that from such a point of view the moral task of Christianity should be less thought of, and those very relations of life which we cannot but regard as peculiarly constituting the moral sphere of Christianity, appear more or less indifferent. As with the Apostle's view of marriage, so with his view of slavery. He exhorts the slave rather to continue a slave because he holds it as a general opinion that all should remain in those circumstances in which they, as Christians, are, vv. 17, 20, 24. And yet we cannot but judge that the abolition of slavery is a requirement of the moral consciousness which agrees

in this subject showed itself to have such considerable influence, there could be no explanation of the intercourse of the sexes that did not go back to the antithesis of the two principles, spirit and matter. When such principles formed the background, every view on marriage was of great importance; especially, if this was the case, would the attention of the Gnostics be directed to the question; and it is necessary to have the principles of the Gnostics before our eyes if we are to understand the different ideas about marriage aright. Gnostics like Valentine and Basilides, who conceived a less abrupt antithesis between spirit and matter, did not simply reject marriage. In fact the former thought of the aeons of the spirit-world as pairs joined in marriage; while with the latter ethical considerations stood too high to admit of being seriously limited by his Gnostic dualism. Those Gnostics, however, whose views and principles were most extreme, were correctly divided even by Clement of Alexandria² into two classes. The first class he said allowed promiscuous intercourse between the sexes, while the other required in an exaggerated way a continence hostile to God. Divergent as these two views are, both spring from the same dualism. If the relation between spirit and matter is conceived of dualistically, to such an extent that the antithesis between the two can never yield and allow them to be united in an inner harmonious unity, then spirit must be filled with a constant endeavour to come to such an adjustment with matter as is possible. Now this may be brought about in two ways. Either spirit may seek completely to sever the bond which connects it with matter, or in its co-existence along with matter, it may

with the spirit of Christianity. Thus although the Apostle's views on marriage and on slavery were limited by the circumstances of the time he lived in, yet we see the universality of the Christian principle in the fact that in the whole history of mankind there has been no advance of moral development that was not essentially founded in Christianity, and was not brought about, without any revolutionary pressure, by its quietly working influence.

¹ In the third book of the *Stromata*, where he treats of the doctrine of marriage at great length, c. 5:—*φέρει εἰς δύο διελόντες πράγματα ἀπάσας τὰς αἰρέσεις ἀποκρινόμεθα αὐτοῖς. ἥ γάρ τοι ἀδιαφόρως ζῆν διδάσκουσιν, ἥ τὸ ὑπέρτον ἀγνοῦσαι, ἐγκράτειαν διὰ δυσσεβείας καὶ φιλαπεχθημοσύνης καταγγέλλουσι.*

regard all that takes place in it and by means of it, *i.e.* all the works of the flesh, as a thing entirely indifferent, by which the being of the spirit is not touched at all. On the latter side stood those who followed the principle which is ascribed to the Nicolaitans: *ὅτε παραχρήσασθαι τῇ σαρκὶ δεῖ*, that one must let the flesh have free course, in order that being left to itself it may wear out and exhaust itself. Fleshly lust was to have its natural course, in which it was not to be restricted.¹ Accordingly the Nicolaitans are said (as is said of other Gnostic sects as well), to have practised the most shameless licentiousness.² The strictest dualists being also the most pronounced opponents of Judaism, there were some among them who were carried so far by their antinomianism as to become opponents and contemners of the moral law. Such were those whose tendency was indicated by the Fathers in the term *Antitactae*. They said that the Creator of the universe was their natural father, and that everything that he had made was good, but that one of those who derived their origin from him had sown tares, and thereby engendered the nature of evil, in which he entangled us all, by making us opposed to the father. "Therefore," they said, "we also oppose him, in order to avenge the Father, by acting contrary to the will of the second. If he said, Thou shalt not commit adultery, we say, we commit adultery, in order to make his law void."³ From this antinomianism where everything positive is rejected, it is a small step to that naturalism and communism which completely does away with the distinction of the natural and the moral. This was taught by Carpocrates and his son Epiphanes, who sought a foundation for it on principle in the idea of justice, as a new theory of social life. Epiphanes wrote a book on justice, in which he developed his idea as follows:—The justice of God is community with equality. Heaven is stretched out equally in every direction, and encompasses the earth round about. Night shows all her stars alike, and the author of

¹ Clem. Strom. iii. 5; cp. ii. 20.

² There was no particular sect of Nicolaitans; the name was taken from the Apocalypse, ii. 6, to serve as a general designation of Gentile-Christian libertines.

³ Clem. *loc. cit.* cap. 4.

day, the father of light, Helios, God has poured out from above in equal measure for all who can see. They all see in common, since there is no difference between rich and poor, people and prince, rational and irrational, man and woman, freeman and slave. Nor is it otherwise among the beings without reason. As he communicates himself from above to all living beings, to the good and to the bad, he confirms his justice by this, that no one can have more or can take away from his neighbour so as to have the light doubled for himself. The sun causes common nourishment to grow for all creatures, and gives the same justice to all. All creatures alike are generated in the way of community according to their species, and there is no written law of generation; it would have been abrogated long ago. The same community of the sexes is natural to them all, as the Creator and Father of all, the same just lawgiver, has given to all the same eye for seeing, without making a distinction between the male and the female, between the rational and that which is without reason, or in a word, between one thing and another. To this natural community he opposed the laws as a hostile power. The laws, which cannot hold the ignorance of men in their discipline, taught men to act against the laws. It was the property of the laws which cut and gnawed through the community of the divine law. To this refers the word of the apostle: "By the law I knew sin." The difference between *meum* and *tuum* came in through the laws, and what is common can no longer be enjoyed in common, neither the earth nor its possessions, nor even marriage. The Creator made vines common for all; they refuse neither a sparrow nor a thief; and the same is the case with corn and other fruits. The violation of community, however, created the thief of flocks and fruits. While God created all things common for man, and joined the female and the male together in community, and paired all creations in the same way, he thereby manifested justice, community with equality. But those who were born in this way denied the community by which they came into being, and now one man is to have one woman, when all can take part, as is the case with the other animals.

The stronger sexual desire was implanted in the males for the preservation of the species, and neither law nor custom, nor anything else whatever, can do away with it; it is God's ordinance.¹ While this class of heretics thus set in the place of marriage the most promiscuous sexual intercourse, thus marking the greatest practical aberration made by Gnosticism in its extreme tendency in this direction, those Gnostics who stood on the opposite side would know nothing of marriage or of the intercourse of the sexes. In fact, they made a principle of entirely severing the bond which connects man with the physical material world. While the former school reduced marriage, under the name of a general community, or of freedom and equality, practically to a *πορνεία*, the other school regarded it as simply a *πορνεία*, and so rejected it with all possible hatred and abhorrence. We refer to those who, as Clement describes them,² under the fair name of continence, acted impiously against the creation and the holy Creator of the world, and God, the one ruler of all; and rejected marriage and the generation of children, because, they said, it was not right to bring others into the world who would be unhappy and to provide new nourishment for death. To this class belonged Saturninus, who expressly declared marriage and the begetting of children to be a work of the devil;³ and other Gnostics, especially those of Syria, had such a view of matter that they must have held opinions contrary to marriage on similar grounds. But it was by the Marcionites, more than any others, that this view of marriage was represented. They hold, Clement says,⁴ that nature is evil, because it arose out of matter which is evil, and was created by the just Creator of the world. In order, then, not to populate the world which is made by the Creator, they require that people should refrain from marriage. They resist their Creator and hasten to the Good, who has called them, but not to him who, as they say, is of quite a different disposition. As they do not wish to leave

¹ Clement, *op. cit.* cap. 2.

² *Op. cit.* cap. 6.

³ Epiphanius, *Hær.* xxiii. 2. *Philos.* vii. 28, p. 245.

⁴ *Op. cit.* cap. 3. Compare what Tertullian says of Marcion as the detestator nuptiarum, *Chr. Gnosis*, p. 268 *sq.*

anything belonging to them behind them here, they are continent, not from free determination, but from hostility to the Creator of the world, being unwilling to use those things which he has created. But while they thus with impious mind wage war against God, and keep far from them the thoughts which are according to nature, and despise the longsuffering and the goodness of God, they make use, even if they will not marry, of the food which is created, and inhale the air of the Creator, since they are his creatures and live in his world. And while they say that they proclaim an entirely new knowledge as the Gospel, they ought to be thankful to the Lord of the world for this, that the Gospel has been announced to them here. So great, as Clement remarks, are the contradictions in which this dualism was involved. But even this shows us how mighty an influence that dualism still exercised, and how profoundly it modified opinion even where the freer spirit of Christianity might have been expected to elevate the Christian consciousness long before this above the abstract antithesis of spirit and matter. Yet it is just this profound interpenetration of the heathen and the Christian views of the world which constitutes the essence of Gnosticism, and not without manifold struggle and conflict could principles so heterogeneous be disengaged from each other and take up their proper relations to each other. Hence, even in individuals in whom the Christian principle had already struck deep root, the Gnostic element again and again gained the ascendancy. This we see in a notable manner in the case of Tatian, a man who held a position very close to that of Justin Martyr in the series of the apologists, and yet took up a line in relation to Christian asceticism which justifies us in reckoning him among the Gnostics. He wrote a work on Christian perfection,¹ in which he appears to have treated specially of the question of marriage. In the passage 1 Cor. vii. 5, he asserted that the marriage the apostle speaks of is only the spiritual union of the husband and wife in prayer, and he declares matrimonial coition to be a communion of corruption which puts an end to prayer. The words

¹ Περὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν σωτῆρα καταρτισμοῦ. Clem. Strom. iii. 12.

of the apostle are to be understood, not as conceding, but as deterring: one should not, the Apostle says, serve two masters; if the husband and wife are united and agree in prayer, they serve God; but if not, they serve incontinence, fornication, and the devil. Tatian is therefore regarded as the founder of the Encratites, who, following the precedent of Saturninus and Marcion, set up the principle of celibacy, and held it to be a reproach to the first pair that they joined together for sexual intercourse and the begetting of children: he is charged with the blasphemy of having denied salvation to the first parents of mankind.¹ In genuine dualistic fashion he appears to have drawn a distinction between the law and the Gospel, that if the God of the law allowed not only polygamy, but even marriage, he must have been quite a different being from the God of the Gospel. In support of his view of marriage he no doubt appealed—in fact the title of his work suggests that he appealed—chiefly to the life of the Redeemer himself. Clement couples with Tatian an adherent of the Valentinian school, Julius Cassian, said to be the founder of the Docetae. He devoted a work to the subject of continence or eunuchism in which he contended that it was not legitimate to infer from the sexual form of men and women that God intended them for sexual intercourse. If this organisation of human nature were from the God to whom we seek to come, he would not have said that eunuchs are blessed, nor would the prophet have said that they were no dry tree (Isa. lvi. 3). Otherwise we should be forced to blame the Redeemer that he re-formed us and delivered us from error and the communion of the sexual organs. For this Cassian appealed to a saying of the Lord contained in the Gospel of the Egyptians: to the question of Salome, when that which she was asking should be known, he answered, "When you shall have trodden under foot the garment of shame, and the two are one, and in the unity of the male, and female there shall be neither male nor female."²

The absolute rejection of marriage is the heretical extreme. Within the Christian Church it was desired to avoid the extreme,

¹ Eusebius, E. H. iv. 28 sq.

² Clem. *op. cit.* cap. 13.

but, if that were avoided, still to hold fast essentially the same view. No one remained nearer to this view than Tertullian. It is true that, as a Montanist, he only represents one particular tendency of Christian thought and custom, but even before his Montanist period, he stood very near to the Montanist way of thinking, and this is but one proof the more of the many various modifications and degrees which found a place under one and the same fundamental view. The complete continence and celibacy which the Gnostics and Encratites required became an object of Christian ascetic endeavour, but with this difference, that marriage was not called in question; allowing marriage, it was sought to approach as nearly as possible to the same standard of perfection. What Tertullian fought for with all the acuteness of his sophistical dialectic and all the fire of his rhetoric, was monogamy.¹ There can be only one marriage; what goes beyond this, second marriage, falls under that abhorrence of *πορνεία*, with which the Gnostics and Encratites rejected marriage, as such. In the accursed Lamech, the first who had two wives, second marriage had a fitting place as the second crime after murder. He declared that it was not a double marriage, for at the root of the matter it made no difference whether a man had two wives one after the other or both at once, but simply adultery. A wife who had lost her husband, if she had lived at variance with him, must be the more bound to one with whom she had still a suit before God. If she had lived in peace with him, then also she must abide with him from whom she would not have wished to be separated: she must pray continually for his soul, and sacrifice on the anniversaries of his departure, and hope to be united with him again at the resurrection. In this case, if she should marry again, she will have the first man in her spirit and the second in the flesh, and this is adultery if a woman divide her consciousness between two men.² Now, the remarkable point is, that the arguments Tertullian uses to contend

¹ Cp. Hauber, Tertullian's Kampf gegen die zweite Ehe. Ein Beitrag zur christlichen Sittengeschichte. Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1845, p. 607 *sq.*

² De Monog. cap. 4, 10.

against second marriage apply to the first marriage equally well. He sees in marriage nothing but the sensual act in which the flesh satisfies its burning appetite. It is only of the second marriage, it is true, that he directly says it is a species stupri. When Paul says that married people seek to please one another, he refers to sensual desire, to that out of which fornication arises; he who looks on a woman with a view to marriage, looks on her with a view to the commission of a stuprum. This naturally applies to marriage in general; it is only the laws, as Tertullian himself says, that make a difference between matrimonium and stuprum, on account of what is prohibited, not on account of the nature of the thing itself.¹ He himself allows that his argument is destructive of marriage in general, but he considers that there is no wrong done in this, because marriage is essentially the same thing as stuprum. The best of all therefore is the original holiness which has nothing in common with stuprum. And if this motive of continence applies to marriage in general, how much more strongly does it speak against second marriage? A single marriage is an indulgence on God's part, for which we must be thankful; but we must not go beyond it by abuse, so that we may not sink deeper and deeper below the first stage, from which even marriage is a declension, to the second.² Especially in his work on monogamy does Tertullian, writing as a champion of Montanism, contend zealously against second marriage. But

¹ De exhort. castitatis, c. 9: Matrimonium et stuprum commixtio carnis. De monog. c. 15: Quid est enim adulterium, quam matrimonium illicitum?

² De exhort. cast. cap. 9. Tertullian distinguishes the following kinds and stages of virginity, cap. 1; Prima species est virginitas a nativitate: secunda virginitas a secunda nativitate, id est a lavacro, quae aut in matrimonio purificat ex compacto, aut in viduitate perseverat ex arbitrio: tertius gradus superest monogamiae, cum post matrimonium unum interceptum exinde sexui renuntiatur. Prima virginitas felicitatis est, non nosse in totum, a quo postea optabis liberari. Secunda virtutis est, contemnere cujus vim optime noris. Reliqua species hactenus nubendi (i.e. never again), post matrimonium morte disjunctum praeter virtutis etiam modestiae laus est. Ad Ux. i. 8; he places the state of widowhood at a higher stage of merit than virginity, inasmuch as—facile est, non appetere, quod nescias, et aversari, quod desideres nunquam. Gloriosior continentia, quae jus suum sentit, quae, quid viderit, novit.

on this point the Montanist view was not essentially different from the general Christian view; it was the exaggeration of the Montanists, with the opposition which it called forth, that removed the prejudice against second marriage which had till then prevailed—but up to that time it was generally disapproved and held to be at the best a less offensive adultery.¹ This view of second marriage, however, must, while it prevailed, have reacted upon the view taken of the first, and made it also to appear as only the lesser evil compared with *πορνεία*. It thus gives us a most interesting insight into the character of the moral and ascetic spirit of that age. In Tertullian himself, more than in any other writer, we notice how undeveloped the idea of morality still was. A doctrine of morals which forbids a practice and then allows it again, and which seems to set up its principles and commands in the strictest and most universal way, only to introduce an indulgence of them afterwards, has essentially a very ambiguous character. And what is yet more remarkable is that in the very midst of the exhortations to rule and mortify the sensual desires, the language of sensuality is heard, and with what appears to be the most earnest zeal for Christian asceticism there is mixed a most carnal inclination. In what sensual expressions and images does Tertullian speak of marriage; in all that he says on the first and the second marriage how clearly do we see the most burning desire for that very thing, against which he is contending as a purely material impulse! How far does he seem to be, in his Montanist way of thinking, from the whole higher moral notion of marriage, when he places the whole essence of marriage, that in which he says it consists, in the entirely sensual act of carnal intercourse.² In this way the first marriage appears, when it is insisted so strongly that that is to be

¹ Compare Athenag., Leg. cap. 33. ὁ δεύτερος (γάμος) εὐπρεπὴς ἐστὶ μοιχεία. He who withdraws from his first wife, even if she is dead, is in secret an adulterer; he goes beyond the hand of God and severs the band of sexual intercourse which makes of two one flesh. From the monarchical view which lies at the basis of the Clementine Homilies, as well as from the abhorrence of *πορνεία*, expressed in that work, we infer that it can have allowed one marriage only. Compare Die christliche Gnosis. p. 374 sq., 400.

² Nuptiae ipsae ex eo constant, quod est stuprum. De exhort. cast. cap. 9.

the limit, as being a mere compromise with sensuality. A man is not to go further, to a second marriage, because he has no confidence in his own moral power and cannot expect to get the better of sensual lust in any other way than by the outward removal of the object to which it refers. Thus what is generally taken to be moral rigorism, it is true, but also certainly a most estimable moral earnestness, is in truth at the same time the confession of a lack of moral power. This appears with equal plainness in Tertullian's zeal in insisting on the veiling of virgins. Virgins must be veiled, he requires, as soon as the body is developed and the sexual consciousness has awakened; from this time forward they are not virgins but women, and in accordance with the Apostle's command they must be veiled.¹ What notions of modesty and holiness must we suppose to have actuated this zealot for discipline and the sense of shame, when we find him directly stating, as a thing that was self-understood, that holy men and virgins could not look at each other without blushing, could not meet one another openly without feeling sexually excited!² A wall of separation must therefore be erected between the two; but, this being done, chastity is sufficiently protected behind this rampart, and the inner desire may be simply let alone.³ Here we have again that external morality, where moral requirements ask for nothing more than the drawing of an outward line of separation, by which the moral and the immoral are to be distinguished. Morality is not here morality of disposition, but a certain outward behaviour, negative or positive, by which one satisfies a certain requirement

¹ *De vel. virg.* cap. 12. *Agnosce et mulierem, agnosce et nuptam de testimoniis et corporis et spiritus, quae patitur et in conscientia et in carne. Haec sunt tabellae priores naturalium sponsarum et nuptiarum. Impone velamen extrinsecus habenti tegumen intrinsecus. Tegantur etiam superiora, cujus inferiora nuda non sunt.*

² *Op. cit.* c. 2. *Ejusdem libidinis est, videri et videre. Tam sancti viri est, subfundere, si virginem viderit, quam sanctae virginis, si a viro visa sit.* Thus we see the strength of the sexual impulses in the fire of the African nature of a Tertullian as well as of an Augustine.

³ *C. 15.* *Vera et tota et pura virginitas nihil magis timet, quam semet ipsam—confugit ad velamen capitis quasi ad galeam, quasi ad clypeum, qui bonum suum protegat adversus ictus tentationum, adversus jacula scandalorum, etc.*

which is set up as the highest norm. Thus there are actions and states which as such are counted moral; chastity does not consist in the chaste mind of the married persons, the truly chaste are the virgines and the spadones, and they alone, who refrain entirely from a thing which even in the legal form of marriage cannot take place without reducing the married persons to a secondary stage of morality. Thus even at this period the highest value is attached to the life of celibacy; it is preferred to married life because it is held to be the surest and most immediate way to attain to God.¹ Yet it is always true, that where sensual desire is not conquered inwardly, but only warded off outwardly, the enemy, who is thought to have been conquered, again and again lifts himself up, and appears only in another form to assert his old right; and so it was here. Those virgins, who appeared to have for ever renounced marriage and every enjoyment of wedded life, yet had a desire to marry and live in wedded intercourse. If earthly marriage had no charm for them, their desire was but the stronger to be brides of heaven, *nuptae Deo* or *Christo*. This *Deo* or *Christo nubere* is a very current idea even at the time we are speaking of, and the pious fancy of an age fanatically bent on celibacy, busied itself largely in decking out the heavenly marriage with everything that could compensate for those pleasures of the earthly marriage which had not been enjoyed.² And the

¹ Athenagoras, Leg. c. 33. εὖροις δ' ἂν πολλοὺς τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν, καὶ ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας, καταγρησκοντας ἀγάμους, ἐλπίδι τοῦ μᾶλλον συνέσεσθαι τῷ Θεῷ.—τὸ ἐν παρθενίᾳ καὶ ἐν εὐνοχίᾳ μέναι μᾶλλον παρίστησι τῷ Θεῷ. Compare Tert. ad Ux. i. 6. Quot enim sunt, qui statim a lavacro carnem suam obsignant? quot item, qui consensu pari inter se matrimonii debitum tollunt, voluntarii spadones pro cupiditate regni coelestis? Comp. de cultu fem. ii. 10.

² Tert. ad Ux. i. 4. Malunt enim Deo nubere, Deo speciosae, Deo sunt puellae. Cum illo vivunt, cum illo sermocinantur, illum diebus et noctibus tractant, orationes suas velut dotes domino adsignant, ab eodem dignationem velut munera dotalia, quotiescunque desiderant, consequuntur. Sic aeternum sibi domum domini occupaverunt, ac jam in terris non nubendo de familia angelica deputantur. Talium exemplis feminarum,—Tertullian addresses his wife—ad aemulationem te continentiae exercens spiritali affectione carnalem illam concupiscentiam humabis, temporalia et volatica desideria formae vel aetatis immortalium bonorum compensatione delendo. Comp. De exhort. cast. c. 13; De vel. virg. c. 16: Mentire aliquid ex his, quae intus sunt (by veiling her head the virgin gives herself out

sensual interest thrust itself into the exercises of asceticism in a yet more striking form. At the time of Cyprian it had become not uncommon for those who devoted themselves to the ascetic life, and who thought that by exciting the sensual impulse it could be the more effectively subdued, to live together in a sexual familiarity which at the same time was only to have the character of a spiritual intercourse.¹ It was especially the members of the clergy who exposed their morality to this dangerous test.

The dualistic view of the world which entered so deeply into Christianity held that evil consisted simply in the uncleanness of matter, and thus led to the highest requirement of morality being made to consist in the principle that whatever defiles the spirit by contact with matter must be separated and eliminated from the life of the spirit. According to this view, marriage, inasmuch as it belongs to the material and carnal life, was necessarily regarded as objectionable. But on the other side, spirit and matter, or spirit and flesh, are so intimately connected, and are so essentially in each other that even the strictest dualism cannot put asunder what God has joined together. Thus, however strictly the antithesis was held as an abstract general principle, yet it was necessary to relax it for the ends of practical life, and there was no other way to unite the two positions than that the one was allowed and the other not excluded; and definite lines of demarca-

to be, what in herself, inwardly, in her consciousness, she is not, a mulier) ut soli Deo exhibeas veritatem. Quamquam non mentiris nuptam. Nupsisti enim Christo, illi tradidisti carnem tuam, illi sponsasti maturitatem tuam. Incede secundum sponsi tui voluntatem. Christus est, qui et alienas sponsas et maritatas velari jubet, utique multo magis suas.

¹ Virgins of this kind were called *συνείσακτοι*; Eusebius, Ec. Hist. vii. 30. *συνείσακτοι γυναῖκες, ὡς Ἀντιοχείς ὀνομάζουσι*. From Cyprian, Epist. 61, we see in how unchaste and shameless a way this sort of asceticism was carried on. We hear of virgins who themselves acknowledged, se cum viris dormisse, namely with a deacon, but asserted se integras esse. Cyprian denounces the practice: quid Christus et dominus et iudex noster cum virginem sibi dicatam et sanctitatis suae destinata[m] jacere cum altero cernit, quam indignatur et irascitur?—Et cum omnes omnino disciplinam tenere oporteat, multo magis praepositos et diaconos curare hoc fas est.—Quomodo enim possunt integritati et continentiae praeesse, si ex ipsis incipiant corruptelae et vitiorum magisteria procedere? This unchaste practice continued afterwards, as we see from the prohibitions of it.

tion thus required to be drawn, within which the one principle or the other was to find its application. Here we have the basis of the distinction so important for the history of Christian ethics, between a higher and a lower morality, also of the principle, which arrived at practical importance chiefly in connection with the question of marriage, that even if one renounces the attempt to accomplish the highest moral task, there is yet a sphere of life in which he is moral enough to satisfy the demands of Christian morality. And as the practice of the Christian life, from the very nature of the case, gradually became laxer, that sphere in consequence grew wider, in which a man was not to strive after the highest absolute perfection, but limited his efforts to the minor, subordinate standard. At the beginning even marriage appeared to be only a thing conceded; but in the sequel the prejudice disappeared, not only against the first marriage, but even against the second and succeeding ones.¹ And not only so, but it was thought possible to reconcile the two tendencies, the stricter and the laxer, by the simple expedient of allowing them to exist side by side, and distinguishing two classes, who, though the task of their lives was different, were yet equally justified to the moral judgment. And if in the sphere of morals there had thus been formed, even at this period, a moral aristocracy, what was more natural than that it should take up the closest relation, as being of equal birth, with

¹ Even the Shepherd of Hermas allowed a second marriage, Mand. iv. 4. Qui (a second time) nubit, non peccat, but with this condition: si per se manserit, magnum sibi conquirat honorem apud dominum. For the same reason, however, Tertullian inveighs against the apocryphus pastor moechorum and his scriptura, quae sola moechos amat, and is counted ab omni concilio ecclesiarum inter apocrypha et falsa, adultera et ipsa et inde patrona sociorum. De Pudic. c. 10. 20. Another utterance of Tertullian, found in the same connection in a passage very characteristic of his rigorism, applies to Hermas: Age tu funambule pudicitiae et castitatis et omnis circa sexum sanctitatis, qui tenuissimum filum disciplina ejusmodi veri avia pendente vestigio ingrederis, carnem spiritu librans, animam fide moderans, oculum metu temperans. What is said here is, Deus bonus est. Suis, non ethnicis, sinum subjicit, secunda te poenitentia excipiet, eris iterum de moecho Christianus. The pastor described in calice is a prostitute and ipse Christiani sacramenti, merito et ebrietatis idolum et moechiae asyllum post calicem subsequatur, de quo nihil libentius libas, quam ovem poenitentiae secundae.

the aristocracy which had come forth from the hierarchical development of the Church? If celibacy counted for the highest moral perfection, it now became peculiarly the attribute of the hierarchical class. But as the hierarchy itself was only in process of development, it could not begin all at once with what was highest in reference to morals. At a time when second marriage counted as a sort of adultery, it was very natural that the governors and heads of the Christian Church should first of all be required to refrain from it. The injunction placed by the pastoral epistles in the mouth of the apostle Paul, and meant to be regarded as an injunction given by him, that the ἐπίσκοπος should be the husband of one wife, is a precept of Church discipline as it took form during the course of the second century. The idea of the purity and holiness of the church seemed to require that it should be so.¹ Second marriage was thus to be denied to some and allowed to others. But what is the view of marriage underlying such regulations? Against those who argued for the admissibility of the second marriage from the fact that the apostle had not forbidden it to all, but only to a certain class—to the bishops—Tertullian appealed with good reason to the general priestly character of Christians, and urged that all Christians were alike priests, and that the precept given to the chief officers and in them placed at the head of the Churches, only expressed that which was to be the general rule for all.² But why did not the Roman Church, in its controversy with Montanism, make good the assertion it had put forward of the admissibility of second marriage, with the same force of logic,

¹ Tert. ad Ux. i. 7: Quantum detrahant fidei, quantum obstrepant sanctitati nuptiae secundae, disciplina ecclesiae et praescriptio apostoli declarat.—Aram enim Dei mundam proponi oportet. Toto illa ecclesiae candida (the halo) de sanctitate describitur. With the heathens also, he says, celibacy has this meaning. Pro diaboli scilicet aemulatione. Regem saeculi, Pontificem maximum, rursus nubere nefas est.

² De Monog. cap. 12. Oportebat omnem communis disciplinae formam sua fronte proponi, edictum quodammodo futurum universis impressioni (an edict which was in future to be enforced upon all), quo magis sciret plebs eum ordinem sibi observandum, qui faceret praepositos et ne vel ipse honor aliquid sibi ad licentiam quasi de privilegio loci blandiatur.

and in the same wide application as that of Tertullian on the Montanist side? It could not make up its mind to so bold a step, since the general view of the holiness of celibacy—which did not originate in Montanism, but only found its most definite expression in that sect—was rooted too deeply in the consciousness of the time to be easily got rid of.¹ In order then to unite the two positions, the genuinely Catholic adjustment was adopted, that neither the one principle nor the other was to be binding absolutely and on all, but that each was to have its application in a certain definite sphere of the life of the Church. Thus the absolute requirement which was necessarily conceived to be the true deliverance of the Christian consciousness, was at once degraded to a conditional precept. Second marriage, accordingly, though conceded to the laity, was in no case to be permitted to the bishops. But the monogamy which was thus allowed as against bigamy was itself nothing but a concession, and the original logical and consistent view soon asserted itself within the sphere which was thus marked off, and the justification even of monogamy in the case of the bishops became a matter of dispute. In proportion as the hierarchical constitution of the Church was developed to its definite form, the demands rose which were made on the bishops and on the clergy in general, with regard to married life. Even at the time of the Synod of Nicaea this process had advanced so far that the bishops there assembled were minded to make it a general law of the Church that priests, *i.e.* bishops, presbyters, and deacons, should be bound to abstain from all wedded intercourse; and this would have passed into a formal law at that time, had not the Egyptian bishop, Paphnutius—truly foreseeing the disadvantages which would be entailed upon the Church by a strict obligation to

¹ Yet among the heads of the churches there were many who were married a second time. Quot enim, Tertullian says, de Monog. cap. 12, et bigami praesident apud vos. This is confirmed by the *Philosophoumena*, the author of which work says, ix. 12, p. 290, that under Callistus, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, began *δίγαμοι καὶ τρίγαμοι καθίστασθαι εἰς κλήρους*. *Εἰ δὲ καὶ τις ἐν κλήρῳ ὡν γαμοῖν, μένειν τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν κλήρῳ, ὡς μὴ ἡμαρτηκότα*. According to Dollinger, *op. cit.* p. 140 *sq.*, the question here at issue was, whether the second marriage was contracted before or after baptism.

a continence of which not all were capable—come forward with an emphatic defence of the honour and dignity of the married state. The arguments of this bishop made the deeper impression that he himself led an ascetic life. Thus to refrain from the intercourse of marriage was left to the free choice of every individual, and the Council resolved to be content with insisting that he who had attained the clerical dignity was not at liberty, as the ancient tradition of the Church directed, to enter as a cleric into the wedded state, but that he was not obliged to separate from the wife to whom he was married already.¹ But the conclusion had already been drawn, which followed with equal necessity, both from the hierarchical position of the clergy, and from the view, by no means given up, of the sacredness of unwedded life, and the word once spoken must sooner or later realise itself in practice.

What we have remarked with reference to marriage is true of the general character of the moral notions of our period. On the one hand the moral requirement is set up as an absolute one, and in the abstract as universally binding; but in its practical application, on the other hand, it has only relative force, the moral sphere being arbitrarily divided and limited. Moral action may be, with regard to the same act, either good or bad, according as it is found in this or in that circle of the Christian life. Second marriage, for example, is allowed to the laity, but forbidden to the clergy. Such a standard of moral judgment can only be applied where in general, moral action is separated from disposition, and the true value of it sought not in what is inward, in the disposition, but in what is outward, in the appearance and the special quality of the particular act. Thus there are standing categories in accordance with which certain acts are to be viewed in reference to morality, quite independently of the disposition of the agent; and Christian ethics have by this time come to be acquainted with acts which, being held sinful are simply sins; and on the other hand, with acts which are regarded as good works, and possess moral value in themselves. The Montanists were the first to divide sins

¹ Socr. E. H. i. 11.

into two classes—mortal sins and venial sins;¹ but the distinction arose precisely from that moral tendency of which we have been speaking, to limit the absoluteness of the moral requirement by giving it a limited reference, either only to a certain portion of the moral sphere, or only to a certain class of moral actions. If it is essential to the religious character of Christian ethics that acts which are repugnant to the moral law are regarded as sins, then every sin is a transgression of the divine law, and the condition of its forgiveness lies in the moral disposition of the agent, and nowhere else. Now, when certain transgressions, such as the so-called deadly sins, were marked out as being sins with regard to which the divine forgiveness must be reckoned, if not impossible, yet so doubtful that it must be left to God himself to grant it, the absolute notion of sin is in this way limited to a certain class of sins, and whatever does not belong to this category does not bear the true character of sin, but is in fact not to be regarded as sin at all, and the divine forgiveness may be taken for granted as a thing understood. But let the forgiveness of sins once be made so easy a matter—though only with reference to one definite kind of sins—and the consequence is unavoidable, that this facility of forgiveness will be extended further and further. Thus even the forgiveness of mortal sins comes, in the practice of the Church, to be no such difficult matter, as the retention of the name down to

¹ Compare Tert. de Pudic. c. 2: *Alia erunt remissibilia, alia irremissibilia, secundum quod nemini dubium est, alia castigationem mereri, alia damnationem. Omne delictum aut venia dispungit aut poena: venia ex castigatione, poena ex damnatione.*—Secundum hanc differentiam delictorum poenitentiae quoque conditio discriminatur. *Alia erit, quae veniam consequi possit, in delicto scilicet remissibili, alia, quae consequi nullo modo possit, in delicto scilicet irremissibili.* There are, says Tertullian, c. 19, quaedam delicta quotidianae incursionis, to which we are all subject. Cui enim non accidet, aut irasci inique et ultra solis occasum, aut et manum immittere, aut facile maledicere, aut temere jurare, aut fidem pacti destruere, aut verecundia aut necessitate mentiri. In negotiis, in officiis, in quaestu, in victu, in visu, in auditu quanta tentamur? ut si nulla sit venia istorum, nemini salus competat. Horum ergo erit venia per exoratorem patris Christum. Sunt autem et contraria istis, ut graviora et exitiosa, quae veniam non capiant, homicidium, idololatria, fraus, negatio, blasphemia, utique et moechia et fornicatio et si qua alia violatio templi Dei. Horum ultra exorator non erit Christus.

our own day would lead us to suppose. We see even in our period the growing tendency which prevailed, notably in the Roman Church, to make the forgiveness of sins easy to be obtained; and in proportion as the laxity increased, the earnestness of Christian morals must have sunk to a lower tone.

The sin of adultery and fornication, in the Montanist sense, was the first of the mortal sins to which, as we have already remarked,¹ the door of forgiveness was opened in the Roman church. There can be no doubt that it was the Roman bishop, Zephyrinus, who issued the peremptory edict of the Pontifex Maximus, the bishop of bishops, at which Tertullian took so great offence. Tertullian held that the indulgence thus extended to adulterers was inconsistent and went only half way; that, to be consistent, it should be extended to idolaters and murderers as well, and make shipwreck of all discipline.² But this inconsistency was remedied by the immediate successor of Zephyrinus. Callistus, we learn from the work of his unknown opponent, drew up, before he became bishop of Rome, a general scheme of forgiveness of sins, in which the notion of so-called mortal sins which had been up to this time in vogue, was completely done away with, and every one who had committed such a sin found the door open after the performance of penance for his reception once more to the communion of the Church.³ And this was not a transitory phenomenon, but became

¹ *Vide supra*, p. 46.

² De Pudic. c. 5 : Quid agis mollissima et humanissima disciplina? Aut omnibus eis hoc esse debebis (*beati enim pacifici*), aut si non omnibus, nostra esse. Idololatrien quidem et homicidam semel damnas, moechum vero de medio excipis? idololatrae successorem, homicidae antecessorem, utriusque collegam.

³ Philos. Orig. ix. 12, p. 290. The writer asserts that Callistus, as an opponent of the Church, set up a school, and was the first to think of remitting those things in which men find pleasure, saying that from him all should receive forgiveness of sins. If a Christian sinned, the sin should not be imputed to him, so soon as he resorted to the school of Callistus. This announcement was made with special reference to those who turned to the Catholic Church from a heresy or a body separated from the Church. Further, he taught that if a bishop sinned, even mortally, he ought not to be deposed; he allowed marriage to the clergy on the terms above mentioned (p. 266), and last of all allowed Christian women, who were unmarried and still in the vigour of their youth, to marry a man according to their own choice, whether a freeman, poorer than themselves,

from this time forward the standing practice of the Church, and was soon after this much confirmed by the discussions, as to the restoration of the lapsi to the Church. The persecutions of the Christians in the age subsequent to Callistus gave abundant occasion for such discussions. The view and the practice adopted by

or a slave, and thus to contract a marriage which Roman law did not recognise. Compare Döllinger, Hippolytus and Callistus, p. 125 *sq.*, where an attempt is made to determine what are the facts which give these charges whatever truth they have, and to justify what is found to be true in them, from the circumstances of the time. According to the *Philosophoumena*, Callistus appealed in support of his theory to such passages as Romans xiv. 4, and Matt. xiii. 30 *sq.* He also quoted Noah's ark, which contained dogs, wolves, ravens, and all sorts of beasts, clean and unclean together. So it must be, he said, in the Church. In the same connection we hear (*Philos.* p. 294 *sq.*) of an Alcibiades from Apamea in Syria, who came to the time of Callistus, with a book of revelations bearing the name of Elxai, on the authority of which he proclaimed a new forgiveness of sins. This forgiveness was to be given by the repetition of Christian baptism in the name of the greatest and highest God, and of his son the great King, with an invocation of the seven witnesses named in the book (heaven, water, the holy spirits, the angels of prayer, oil, salt, and earth). The formula was as follows:—*τούτους τοὺς ἑπτὰ μάρτυρας μαρτύρομαι, ὅτι οὐκέτι ἁμαρτήσω, οὐ μοιχεύσω, οὐ κλέψω, οὐκ ἀδικήσω, οὐ πλεονεκτήσω, οὐ μισήσω, οὐκ ἀθετήσω, οὐδὲ ἐν πᾶσι πονηροῖς εὐδοκήσω.* He said repeatedly: *ὃ μοιχοὶ καὶ μοιχαλίδες καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται, ἐν θέλῃτε ἐπιστρέψαι ἵνα ἀφεθῇσονται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, καὶ ὑμῖν εἰρήνη καὶ μέρος μετὰ τῶν δικαίων ἀφ' οὗ ἂν ἀκούσητε τῆς βίβλου ταύτης καὶ βαπτισθῇτε ἐκ δευτέρου σὺν τοῖς ἐνδύμασι.* The data given us in the *Philosophoumena* and in Epiphanius, *Haer.* xix. 30, 53, leave us in no doubt as to the essentially Ebionitic character of the Elcesaites. Another characteristic trait is preserved in Eusebius, *E. H.* vi. 38, where he quotes from a homily of Origen on Psalm lxxii., the doctrine of an Elcesaites, that he τὸν ἀπόστολον τέλειον ἀθετεῖ, that he rejects the apostle Paul. The author of the *Philosophoumena* tells us, p. 293, that he very strenuously resisted the new doctrine of Alcibiades; and thus this Alcibiades is a new member of one side of the controversy which continued throughout a long period as well in ethics as in the doctrine of the Trinity. It is remarkable how, with the Montanists, with Tertullian, with the author of the *Philosophoumena*, Hippolytus, or whoever it may be, and with the Novatians, these two things always belong alike to the true orthodox conception of Christianity, strictness in ecclesiastical discipline, or the notion of a church communion which excludes from itself as far as possible everything unholy, and the concrete notion of the personal Logos, while the opponents on the other side, Callistus and Alcibiades the Elcesaites or Ebionites, are equally lax on the one point as on the other. The Ebionites, it is well known, rejected the doctrine of the *Λόγος Θεός*. Compare Ritschl, *über die Secte der Elcesaiten*, in the *Zeitschr. für histor. Theol.* 1853, p. 573 *sq.* Entstehung der alt-kath. Kirche, 2d ed. p. 234. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für Wissensch. Theol.* 1858, p. 417.

the Roman Church with regard to the lapsi are best known from the document addressed to Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, by the presbyters and deacons of Rome when occupied with filling up the Roman episcopal seat after the martyrdom of Fabianus. According to this epistle there was no longer any question as to the permissibility of receiving persons in such a position; but care was to be taken that that communion of the Church by which the wound was healed should not be granted too hastily or without a proper period of penance. This was counted even then as the *antiqua severitas*, *antiqua fides*, *antiqua disciplina*, and the writer of the Epistle¹ was that Novatian, who did indeed return afterwards to the old strictness of the penance which the Church enjoined, but could only assert it as a schismatic.

Over against mortal sins stand good works. They are to be regarded from the same point of view. As the former are simply sins, the latter are in themselves good. According to this notion of good works practical duty is limited to a certain class of actions—particularly such as prayer, fasting, and almsgiving. To such an extent is this the case, that whatever does not belong to one or other of these categories appears to have no definite moral value. Here at length we see clearly and distinctly how in general the moral standard which here determines what is and what is not moral action, is not a standard of quality of the disposition, but a standard of quantity of the outward performance. Though a greater or less quantum of good works is required of every Christian, yet the highest cannot be made the duty of every individual, a man can do more than he is in fact obliged to do, and as every good action is morally meritorious, there are not only meritorious but also supermeritorious actions. It is a very significant fact with reference to the ethics in process of formation in the Catholic Church, that this distinction, one of such importance and coming so near the heart of the subject, was made by the first writer of the Roman Church who describes the sphere of Christian morality.

¹ It is to be found among the Epistles of Cyprian, as Ep. 31. Compare Ep. 52, 53.

In the fifth parable of the third book of the Shepherd of Hermas, the shepherd appears in the form of an angel to Hermas, who is sitting at the time of fasting upon a mountain, and instructs him as to the true kind of fasting, showing by the example of a servant at work in a vineyard who does more than his master has commanded him, that the true fasting is the observance of the commandments of God.¹ In the explanation of the parable it is said: "Keep the commandments of the Lord, and thou shalt be approved, and enter into the number of those who keep his commandments. But if, besides that which the Lord has commanded, thou shalt do something good in addition, thou shalt acquire for thyself a greater dignity and have more honour with the Lord than thou wouldst have had otherwise." That this is very characteristic of the ethical spirit of the time we see from various indications. Not only does such a writer as Hermas speak of an *adjicere aliquid boni*, but even Origen places the conduct which Christian morality requires under the point of view of this double task. So long, Origen says,² as a man does merely what he ought, *i.e.* what is commanded, he is an unprofitable servant (Luke xvii. 10). But if he does something in addition to what is commanded, he is not merely an unprofitable servant, but it is said to him: "Thou good and faithful servant" (Matt. xxv. 15). And what it is that is added to the commandment and is done in addition to what it is a man's duty to do, the apostle Paul tells us in 1 Cor. vii. 25. This goes beyond the commandment. He then, who, after doing what is commanded, does this in addition to it, and preserves his virginity, is no unprofitable servant, but is called a good and faithful servant. And the case is the same when in spite of the commandment that the preachers of the gospel should live by the gospel, the apostle Paul says that he

¹ L. 3. Simil. 5. 1: *Jejuna certe verum jejunium tale. Nihil in vita tua nequiter facias, sed mente pura servi Deo, custodiens mandata ejus et in praecepta ejus ingrediaris, neque admiseris desiderium nocens in animo tuo. Crede autem Domino, si haec feceris, timoremque ejus habueris, atque abstineris ab omni negotio malo, Deo te victurum. Haec si feceris, jejunium magnum consummabis acceptumque Domino. Thus fasting itself is taken in an ideal sense.*

² Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, iii. 3.

had made no use of this (1 Cor. ix. 15). Repugnant as the notion of such a super-merit of moral action is to the spirit of the gospel, yet many tendencies co-operated from which it followed as a very natural consequence. First of all it had its root in the general way of thinking with regard to morals which was mentioned above. In respect to the question here before us, that way of thinking found characteristic expression in the phrases *adjuvare aliquid boni*, *addere aliquid preceptis*, because the view it took of moral action was that it was a matter of quantity. If demands are set up which cannot be carried out with strict consistency in practice, and so cannot have the same binding force on all, and with regard to marriage this was involved in the nature of the case, the natural result is, that there comes to be an aristocratic distinction not only of two ranks but also of two degrees of virtue, and thus also of two degrees of merit, one of which is sufficient for men as they commonly are; while the higher one is for those who feel within themselves the impulse and the call not to stand still at the ordinary average level. But in addition to this the whole tendency of moral action at this time towards external ecclesiastical legality, the desire and effort to set up a norm for moral actions in special commands, to classify them and define their limits with regard to each other, this tendency could not but engender the opinion that a man could indeed do more than was outwardly commanded; but that if he observed what was commanded within a certain circle, the merit was sufficient to satisfy the claims of Christian virtue and perfection.

As the essence of Christian morality is placed principally in external action, in works, it is also impressed with a peculiar stamp by the fact that the actions to which it refers are not only prescribed by the Church, but have their common unity in the idea of the Church. Here it is curious to notice how even in the Shepherd of Hermas the whole moral conduct of Christians is determined by the idea of the Church. The Church is represented under the image of a tower, around which seven women are standing who support it according to the command of the Lord. The

first is faith, by which the elect of God are saved. The daughter of faith is continence; he who follows her becomes happy in his life, because he refrains from all bad works. The other five also are intimately related, each being a daughter of another; they are called Simplicity, Innocence, Modesty, Discipline, Love (*Charitas*). From faith springs continence, from continence simplicity, from simplicity innocence, from innocence modesty, from modesty discipline and love. He who serves these, and is able to practise the works belonging to them, will dwell in the tower with the saints of God. The same idea is worked out at greater length in the ninth parable. Here the Church is represented by twelve virgins. The four highest are Faith, Continence, Might, Patience; then follow Simplicity, Innocence, Chastity, Cheerfulness, Truth, Insight, Concord, and Love. Over against them stand twelve women dressed in black—Faithlessness, Excess, Unbelief, Sensuality, Sadness, Malice, Desire, Anger, Untruth, Folly, Arrogance, and Hatred. All the stones which are not carried by the former virgins through the gate of the rock, which is the Son of God, into the tower, to build it, are rejected; and the women in black clothes carry the stones which are declared unfit for use, back to the place whence they were taken. So essentially does Christianity, here realising in itself the idea of the Church, consist in the practice of the virtues, the sum of which amounts to the keeping of the divine commandments. Faith, which stands at the head of all the virtues, is itself only the root of virtue, the evangelical notion of faith gives place to the predominant tendency towards the practical and the moral. In fact, in the thought of *Hermas*, faith is simply the command which stands before all the other commands, to believe in the one God, who made all things out of nothing. Thus we find expressed even here what is the root-idea of Catholicism, that the essence of Christianity consists not so much in faith as in works, or in the practice of the virtues. And what gives the virtues—the general forms of moral behaviour—their specially Christian character, is simply that it is the Church (which appears in person in the Shepherd of *Hermas* for this purpose) that gives

the exhortation to cultivate them, and issues the precepts with reference to them in the form of divine commands.¹ The characteristic feature of the Christian morality of the period we are dealing with, as seen in all the phenomena now noticed, is that in its main tendency it bears the likeness of later Catholicism. But on the other side there are not wanting traits in which the purer moral spirit of evangelical Christianity asserts itself. Of the doctors of the Church whose views and principles call for most consideration on this point, no one stands out more than Clement of Alexandria. It is true that he is one of the chief representatives of the extreme tendency of the times which aimed at detachment from everything material; for in his Gnostic he set up the ideal of a perfection, the highest aim of which is to make man divine by perfect freedom from passion.² Yet all the more do we see in him the operation of evangelical truth, when, with regard to those circumstances of practical life in which the ascetic spirit of the age proved itself most one-sided, he was able to maintain the healthy sense of practical Christianity which as far as possible keeps at a distance from extremes. With regard to marriage no doctor expressed so sensible

¹ Compare L. 1. Vis. iii. 8. L. 3. Simil. ix. 15.

² Compare, e.g., the passage in the Miscellanies iv. 22. *Αὕτη ἡ κατὰ δύναμιν ἑξομοίωσις πρὸς Θεὸν τὸ φυλάττειν τὸν νοῦν ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ σχέσει· αὕτη δὲ νοῦ σχέσις ὡς νοῦ· ἡ δὲ ποικίλη διάθεσις γίνεται τῇ πρὸς τὰ ὑλικά προσπαθεία.* Comp. die christl. Gnosis, p. 506 sq. It is not less characteristic of Clement that above all those attainments which are possible in the way of the spirit's withdrawing from the material into itself, and being absorbed in itself, he places the practical exercise of moral conduct. He regards the vindication of the former standpoint by the energy of practice as the true Gnosticism, as the positive which must be added to the former, which is negative. Compare on this point, e.g., Misc. vi. 7: the Gnostic soul is sanctified *κατὰ τὴν ἀποχὴν τῶν γεωδῶν πυρώσεων, ἀγνίσκεται δὲ καὶ τὸ σῶμα, ἐν ᾧ οἰκεῖ, ἐξειδικιοῦνται εἰς ἐλεγκρίνειαν ἀγίου νεῶ· ὁ δὲ ἐν τῷ σώματι καθαρισμὸς τῆς ψυχῆς πρώτης πρώτος οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ ἀποχὴ τῶν κακῶν, ἣν τινες τελείωσιν ἡγοῦνται· καὶ ἔστιν ἀπλῶς τοῦ κοινοῦ πιστοῦ, Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἑλλήνος, ἡ τελείωσις αὕτη, τοῦ δὲ γνωστικοῦ μετὰ τὴν ἄλλοις νομιζομένην τελείωσιν ἡ δικαιοσύνη εἰς ἐνέργειαν εὐποιίας προβαίνει. καὶ ὅτ' ὃν δὴ ἡ ἐπίστασις τῆς δικαιοσύνης εἰς ἀγαθοποιίαν ἐπιδέδωκεν, τούτῳ ἡ τελείωσις ἐν ἀμεταβόλῳ ἔξει εὐποιίας καθ' ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ διαμένει.* In the same way he demands, Misc. iv. 6, that one should be *οὐκ ἀποχῇ κακῶν μόνον δικαιωθείς, πρὸς δὲ καὶ τῇ κυριακῇ τελειωθείς εὐποιᾷ.* The spirit retires into itself, but only to work all the more energetically outwards in moral conduct.

an opinion as Clement. He pronounces eunuchism to be a special gift of God, and ascribes special honour to monogamy; but, on the other hand, he does not reject second marriage. Those who called marriage fornication, and appealed to the example of Christ, he met by saying that the reason why the Lord did not marry was that the Church was his bride, and that as a man not of ordinary nature, he was not in need of a helpmate according to the flesh. As little did he need to beget children as he remained eternally the Son of God. But Christ himself said that man was not to put asunder what God had joined together. Equally far were the Apostles from rejecting marriage. Peter and Philip begot children, Philip gave his daughters in marriage, and Paul also did not shrink from speaking of a *σύζυγος* in one of his epistles. Eunuchism was no virtue if it did not proceed from love to God.¹ Not only does Clement not allow that celibacy has any absolute advantage over married life, but he recognises the importance of marriage in ethics. It forms, he says, a peculiar sphere of social life, in which moral power can display itself. The perfect man who makes the Apostles his examples, shews himself a true man by not choosing a life of solitude. He gains a victory over men if he lives in marriage, begets children, and cares for his household, and yet is not drawn away by this care from the love of God, but withstands all temptations that arise to him out of his children and wife, his domestics and possessions. He who has no household, remains free from many temptations; but as he only cares for himself, he stands lower than he who, though he cannot devote the same care to his own salvation, yet possesses in the economy of life a more than equivalent advantage, inasmuch as he, in fact, presents on a small scale a likeness of the true universal providence.² In respect of marriage accordingly, Clement goes back to the disposition with which one chooses the life of marriage or of celibacy. In the same way, in the work he devoted to the discussion of the question, "What rich man is he who is saved?" he makes everything depend on the inward attitude taken up towards outward possessions, and the use

¹ Misc. iii. 1, 6.² Misc. vii. 12.

that is made of them. The true rich man is he only who is rich in virtues, and can live in every relation of life purely and faithfully; the false rich man is the rich man according to the flesh, who makes his life depend on an outward possession, which comes and disappears, which passes from one to another, and at last belongs to no one at all.¹ Thus Clement looks at the various relations of life and at the question specially pressing at the time, from a genuinely moral point of view, and with regard to the interests of practical Christianity. And in the same spirit did he speak on the subject of martyrdom. Highly as he values martyrdom he yet disapproves of that fanatical eagerness for it which disregards all prudence in dangers, and accordingly does not condemn flight in persecutions in the unconditional way that Tertullian does.² The essence of martyrdom, according to him, lies in purifying oneself with illustrious success from sins, and suffering willingly all that the confession of Christianity requires.³ As Clement was free from Montanist fanaticism and onesidedness, and not only so, but from the belief in the nearness of the Parousia and the catastrophe of the world, he was able to retain the right point of view for the moral relations of life, which that belief was so apt to disturb.⁴

In the views and principles which prevail in it we read the moral spirit of an age, but of whatever nature the views and principles may be which belong to the general consciousness of the age, they afford us no correct standard for judging of its moral character. To do this we require to know how those views and

¹ *Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος*, cap. 19.

² De fuga in persecutione.

³ Clement discusses at length the subject of martyrdom in the fourth book of the *Stromata*; compare c. 9, 10.

⁴ What a contrast there is in this particular between his view of marriage and the begetting of children, and that of Tertullian. The latter says, ad Ux. i. 5: *Adjiciunt sibi homines causas nuptiarum de sollicitudine posteritatis et liberorum amarissima voluptate. Nobis otiosum est. Nam quid gestiamus liberos gerere, quos cum habemus, praemittere optamus, respectu scilicet imminentium angustiarum, cupidi et ipsi, iniquissimo isto saeculo eximi?* Everything referring to married life is merely a *sarcina nuptiarum*. Why should one marry, why have children, why enter into the relations of life at all, which are the true sphere of moral action? Fuga saeculi thus becomes a flight from the world of moral action.

principles are carried out in practical life; whether the prevailing tendency is that which would hold them fast in their original strictness, or that which would more and more have them relaxed. It has been sufficiently shown how decisive a turning-point is marked in this particular by the Montanist period, since Montanism can only be regarded as a reaction against a relaxation of the practice of the Christian life which had been going on for some time and still continued. The works of Tertullian which relate to the practical questions of the day, are in this view a peculiarly abundant source for the history of Christian morals. We learn from them by what arguments it was sought to excuse and justify the mitigations of the old strictness, and what the phenomena were in which the new and freer tendency appeared most noticeably. How greatly, for example, must that enthusiasm for martyrdom in which the moral force by which the Christians were inspired reached its floodmark, have cooled down even in the time of Tertullian, when flight in persecution was so lightly thought of as Tertullian's denunciations of it would lead us to conclude—if the Christians scrupled so little to make use of the modes of deception by which it was possible to induce the heathen authorities to desist from a prosecution—if even whole churches with their clergy at their head, had recourse to such a way of escape?¹ How greatly this want of courage and steadfastness increased afterwards, and how often it resulted even in relapse to heathenism, we see from the existence of the various kinds of Lapsi. In general, as the persecutions ceased, and the Christians lived outwardly in rest and at peace, those virtues became rarer which we are accustomed to think of as the high distinction of the earliest period, and in their place appeared exactly the contrary qualities. Eusebius himself insists upon this fact,² and, in fact, makes the remark in

¹ *De fuga in persec. c. 13*: Massaliter totae ecclesiae tributum sibi irrogaverunt. Nescio dolendum an erubescendum sit, cum in matricibus beneficiariorum et curiborum inter tabernarios et inaneos et fures balnearum et aleones et lenones Christiani quoque vectigales continentur. Hinc episcopatus formam apostoli providentius condiderunt, ut regno suo securi frui possent sub obtentu procurandi?

² *E. H. viii. 1.*

passing to speak of the Diocletian persecution of the Christians. And this persecution he regards as the well-deserved punishment of the laxity and indifference, the envy, the abusiveness and contentiousness, the hypocrisy and misrepresentation which had made such inroads among the Christians. Nor did the bishops fail to exhibit, even at this period, as several well-known examples prove, that lofty arrogance and hierarchicāl desire of rule which have since continued to be characteristic of their order.

Sharply and energetically as the moral and religious character of Christianity was opposed to the notions and views of the heathen world, the antithesis yet passed more and more out of sight as the prevailing views and principles became by degrees larger and freer, and as it came to be made the first consideration to find out what was possible in practice and appropriate to the circumstances. It is from this point of view that we have to regard the course taken by the Christian cultus even at the very beginning of its development.

The apostle Paul stands at the extreme point of the antithesis against the forms of the cultus of heathenism and of Judaism, when addressing the Galatians who had been converted from heathenism to Christianity, but were now at the verge of falling back to the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* which heathenism and Judaism had in common, he asks (iv. 8 *sq.*) how they can reconcile it with their Christian consciousness of God, that they should turn back to the beggarly elements to which they had formerly done service, and direct themselves according to days and months, and times and years? So unworthy of the Christian does everything appear to him to be, that would draw down the free spirit, conscious of its communion with God, to the elements and phenomena of the outward and material life of nature, and bind the spirit to them as if it could not reach God, except by their mediation. And we have to think of this free Christianity, independent of everything external, conscious of its purely spiritual contents, but in outward appearance naked and devoid of all forms of cultus, when we find that even at the time of Celsus what struck the heathens most

with regard to the Christians, was that they appeared to possess none of those things without which they did not see how a religion could exist—no temples, no altars, no images.¹ If a cultus answers more or less perfectly to the religion the idea of which it has to represent and bring to view, in proportion to the dignity and interest of its form, how entirely must Christianity have been wanting in the first pre-requisite of an æsthetical cultus, when the idea it was thought necessary to entertain of Christ himself was that in his outward form he was insignificant, or even ugly?² What lasting effects this character of Christian worship, derived originally from Paulinism, but afterwards impressed by a one-sided ascetic spiritualistic, puritanical tendency, had on the history of the first centuries, we learn from a Spanish synod, which, though it met in an age when Christian worship had found shelter within stately buildings, forbade pictures on the walls, because it saw in such representations of sacred objects a degradation of what was holy.³

But though Christianity seemed, when opposed to heathenism and Judaism, to have little capacity for a cultus like that of those religions, yet it embraced in the view and in the mood on which its religious consciousness was based, the elements of a cultus of its own. The Christian cultus proceeded entirely from that relation of piety which connected the first disciples with the Lord, the relation being seized in the fashion in which at his last interview with them it had received its richest and most touching expression. As the disciples had been together with him then, so Christians wished to be together with him again and again. As often as the believers came together they sought to realise the presence of the Lord still

¹ *Vide supra*, p. 159, and Minucius Felix Octav. cap. 10, where the heathen asks, *cur nullas aras habent, nulla templa, nulla nota simulacra?*

² He is expressly thus called by Justin, Tertullian, Origen, and Clement of Alexandria. The last says, *The Instructor*, iii. 1: *τὸν κύριον αὐτὸν τὴν ὄψιν αἰσχρὸν γεγονέναι διὰ Ἡσαίου τὸ πνεῦμα μαρτυρεῖ* (Isa. liii. 2). Here, as elsewhere (compare vol. i. p. 41, note), the prophets were employed to fill up the omissions of the evangelical history.

³ The Synod at Elvira in the year 305, Canon 36: *Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur, in parietibus depingatur.*

remaining in the circle of his own, and it was impossible to be together with him without doing what he had done the last time he was with his disciples.¹ They ate the bread as his body, and drank the wine as his blood. The apostle Paul is the first to report the words of the Lord as he himself received them from Christian tradition. But so far is he removed from all those notions which afterwards caused the dogmatic view of the sacrament to be imported into the words, and rendered them a cause and source of such great debates and divisions, that he regards the repetition of what Jesus had done as an act merely of commemoration meant to show forth his death only until he himself should come. It was to serve as a compensation for his bodily presence which death had removed : in the bread and wine, as the body and blood of the Lord, which he himself had said they were, it was to represent himself as he was, when face to face with death he was about to shed his blood for the institution of a new covenant, and to give his body for his disciples. In connection with the bread, broken and divided into pieces, the apostle thought of the Church as the body of the Lord, since as it is one and the same loaf of which all partake, so the many members of which the church is composed are all connected together in the unity of one and the same church.² As at the meal which Jesus ate with his disciples, he began the act in question by a prayer of thanksgiving, so the Christian celebration of the supper was most commonly called the Eucharist. The thanksgivings which were spoken on the occasion referred first of all to the life-sustaining gifts of nature which were brought to the common meal, but their connection with the words of the institution by Jesus gave them the force of a peculiar consecration, for the elements of the supper which were set aside from these gifts. Accordingly, in describing the celebration, Justin says³ that the deacons, who stood by the president, distributed the bread which was blessed by the words of the Eucharist, and the wine,

¹ *Vide supra*, vol. i. p. 169.

² 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. Compare xii. 27.

³ *Apol. i. 66 sq.*

mixed with water, not only to all present, but also to the absent.¹ The celebration was also called by the name Agape; the meal of commemoration of the death of the Lord was also to be a meal of that love which united the disciples among one another. But many things which at first, from the nature of the case, belonged together and fitted easily into the ordinary arrangement of life, could not afterwards, when the churches increased in numbers, be kept up in the same way. And so the name Agape was transferred almost entirely to meals which were distinct from the Eucharist, in which, by a system of mutual contributions to the common table, the difference between rich and poor was to be obliterated, and an opportunity given for the continuous exercise of that brotherly love and common spirit which dwelt in the oldest assemblies of the disciples. Thus the two things which were at first united with each other became distinct, and each underwent modifications in its own peculiar direction. The Agape became a freer union of Christian social life, but easily degenerated into abuses, while the Eucharist on the other hand obtained, by means of its liturgical forms, its definite ecclesiastical character.² The original feeling of piety out of

¹ Even this points to the circumstance, that the notion of a material means of salvation was connected with the bread of the Eucharist when consecrated as the body of the Lord, and that people kept it with them to eat a part of it from time to time. It is the *acceptum corpus Domini et reservatum*, of Tertullian: *de Orat.* c. 19. The reference is the same when Tertullian asks the Christian wife of a heathen husband: *ad Uxorem* ii. 5:—*Non sciet maritus, quid secreto ante omnem cibum gastes? et si sciverit panem, non illum credit, qui dicitur* (if you tell him it is bread, he will not believe that it is what you say—what the Christians according to the letter of Pliny asserted that it was—*cibus promiscuus et innoxius*).

² We see from 1 Cor. xi. 20 *sq.*, that the meals to which the Christians came together to celebrate the Eucharist were also Agapae. The disorders which the Apostle had occasion to rebuke even then, made it impossible, as he said, to celebrate a supper of the Lord *κυριακὸν δείπνον φαγεῖν*, i.e. to celebrate the Eucharist, at these meetings, as ought to be the case. Disorders of the same kind took place at the Agapae which are spoken of under this name in the Epistle of Jude, ver. 12. In the Epistle of Ignatius, *Ep. ad Smyrn.* cap. 8: *οὐκ ἐξὸν χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν*, the Agape includes the Eucharist. Tertullian still speaks of a *convivium dominicum*, *ad Ux.* ii. 4: but in the *Apology*, cap. 39, he speaks of the *coena*, which is called Agape as being

which the Christian cultus sprang and developed itself in different directions maintained itself in its purest and directest form in the Paschal celebration of the Church of Asia Minor. The reason why this church clung to the 14th of Nisan with such force and pertinacity and with so real and deep an interest as that which is expressed in the Epistle of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus,¹ was that that day was kept as the anniversary of the last meal of which Jesus had partaken with his disciples. They therefore restricted their celebration to this one day and did not as it appears determine the celebration of the day of the death and of the resurrection in accordance with this day, which of course changed from year to year. The Roman Church on the contrary, feeling it to be of the greatest importance to have firmly settled liturgical forms, regulated the whole of the Paschal celebration with reference to the day of the resurrection, which was never changed. Sunday thus remaining the day which was fixed for the anniversary of the resurrection, the days of the original Paschal week came to regulate not only the cycle of the week, but also the cycle of the year. As every Sunday brought back the thought of the resurrection, so the faithful Christian was to remember on the Wednesday and Friday of every week what had happened in the Paschal week on these days. On Wednesday the Lord's passion had begun with the resolution arrived at by the Sanhedrim to arrest him,² on Friday he had died. These are the *dies stationum*, on which the Christian was to stand upon his guard fasting, as a *miles Christi*,

simply a meal, and of the need that it should not become liable to the reproach of luxury. At the close of his work, *de Jejun.*, in which he speaks as a Montanist to the *Psychici*, he gives himself the strongest confirmation of that reproach, *apud te agape in caccabis fervet, fides in culinis calet, spes in ferculis jacet. Sed majoris est agape (ironical allusion to 1 Cor. xiii. 13), quia per hanc adolescentuli tui cum sororibus dormiunt. Appendices scilicet gulae lascivia atque luxuria est.* Did the character of the Agapae deteriorate so much in so short a time, or may we look upon this as a criterion to determine Tertullian's apologetical trustworthiness?

¹ Vide supra, vol. i. p. 164.

² Cf. the fragment of a *λόγος εἰς τὸ πάσχα*, by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria at the end of the third century, in Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, iii. p. 343.

and to go off guard at a certain hour.¹ When the day came round in the cycle of the year it had of course to be celebrated with greater circumstance. The fast was extended and the whole week received the character of a holy week as in fact it is designated in the Johannine Gospel, xii. 1, that gospel harmonising with the Roman Paschal celebration. Another observance which contributed to exalt the celebration of the passover was the vigils, for which there was a meeting during the night before the festival, in order that the believers might be awake to greet the dawn of the sacred day.²

In addition to the impulse which the last meal of Jesus with his disciples naturally gave to the rise and formation of a Christian cultus, Sunday, made sacred by his resurrection, afforded to that cultus a point of departure, and was mainly the means of carrying it on. There is no doubt that Sunday is the *ἡμέρα κυριακή*, on which the seer of the Apocalypse fell into his ecstasy, i. 10, and the *μία σαββάτων*, the first day of the week, on which Paul wished that the contributions to the subsidy he had set on foot, should be collected, 1 Cor. xvi. 2. According to Justin³ all the Christians who lived in the towns and in the country came together on the day of the sun, to hear the reading of the memorials of the apostles and of the writings of the prophets, for prayer, and for the celebration of the Eucharist, because it was on this day that at the beginning God scattered the darkness and created the world, and Jesus Christ our Redeemer arose from the dead and appeared to his disciples. The sacred day of the Jewish and that of the Christian cultus stood side by side, having the same

¹ Tert. de orat. cap. 10: statio de militari exemplo nomen accepit, nam et militia Dei sumus. De cor. cap. 14: stationibus quartam et sextam dicamus.

² Even Tertullian speaks of the vigils as a part of the Paschal celebration. In the work ad Ux. ii. 4, he asks the Christian wife whether her heathen husband would quietly allow that she solemnibus Paschae abnoctire? Compare as to these vigiliae, *παραυχίδες*, Euseb. E. H. vi. 34; Clem. Alex. Miscell. i. 21. The reference is probably to these vigils when we hear of the convocationes nocturnae, coetus antelucani, of the Christians; and the practice spoken of in the Epistle of Pliny, stato die ante lucem convenire may point to the same thing.

³ Apol. i. 67. *Apol. II. 67.*

religious meaning, but indicating different orders of calculation, the Sabbath being the last day of the week, and Sunday the first. The fact of this difference made Christians the more inclined to keep Sunday, on which day they prayed not kneeling but standing, and never fasted.¹ In order to mark yet more strongly the contrast between the two days, the anti-judaistic tendency of the Roman Church had led it at the time of Tertullian to adopt the practice of continuing the fast of Friday on Saturday as well.² An approach was made to the idea of the Sabbath in the long-established custom of desisting from ordinary business on Sunday as far as possible.³

At the close of the second century and the beginning of the third, Christianity had come to be surrounded with a set of manifold religious forms, partly peculiar to itself, partly borrowed from Judaism and heathenism. Baptism and the Lord's Supper which Justin describes as being in his day simple religious acts, were now accompanied by symbolical practices and mystical ideas,⁴ which invested these two principal constituents of the Christian cultus with a significance similar to that of the heathen mysteries. We see even at this period that in proportion as a new hierarchy

¹ Tert. de cor. 3.

² Tertullian de Jejuniis, c. 14: Vos (the psychici) etiam sabbatum, si quando, continuatis, nunquam nisi in pascha jejunandum. They were to fast on the Easter Saturday, but on no other Sabbath than this one. Tertullian thought he owed so much regard to the Sabbath, because Christ himself affectum creatoris expressit in sabbato non jejunandi honore. Adv. Marc. iv. 12. The Roman custom prevailed in the west to such a degree, that the Synod of Elvira ordained in its 26th canon, errorem placuit corrigi, ut omni sabbati die superpositiones (the continuation of the fast of Friday) celebremus.

³ Tert. de orat. cap. 23. Sicut accepimus solo die dominicæ resurrectionis—anxietatis habitu et officio (this is the true reading, not officia, in distinction from the negotia which follows), cavere debemus, diferentes etiam negotia, ne quem diabolo locum demus.

⁴ On the usages connected with baptism see Tertullian de spectac. cap. 4; Adv. Prax. cap. 26; De bapt. cap. 7; De cor. cap. 3; Adv. Marc. i. 14. By the chrisma, the ἀντίστονον, οὗ ἐχρίσθη Χριστός, as Cyril of Jerusalem calls it (Catech. mystag. 3, 1) Cyprian declares, Ep. 70, that the person baptized becomes an unctus Dei, and can have in himself the grace of Christ, i.e. according to the meaning of the name Christus the act makes him a Christian. In connection with the Lord's Supper, Justin, Apol. ii. 66, thinks of its analogy with the mysteries of Mithra, and Origen speaks of Christian mysteries.

was developed in the Christian Church under the influence of the sacerdotal ideas of the Old Testament, those things which it had to administer could not but become more full of meaning and of mystery. Gnostics who desired to see Christianity separated as rigidly as possible from everything Jewish and heathen, were blamed by Tertullian, and not without reason, because they knew nothing of such a distinction of grades and classes as the order and dignity of Christian worship required.¹ It was especially Marcion who declared that the separation of the catechumens from the faithful which was even then tending to become the practice, was un-Pauline.² The Christian Church as well as the heathen temple, had now its altar,³ its priests, its sacrifices, and Cyprian speaks not only of the sacrifice of prayer, but of the true and perfect sacrifice which the priest, standing in the place of Christ, and doing in imitation of Christ what he did first, presents in the Church to God the Father.⁴

Christ having died at the Jewish passover, and as Christianity could not in its ritual any more than in other points deny its connection with Judaism, Easter and Pentecost continued to be the chief festivals of the Christian cultus. But even the Apostle Paul had called Christ the passover lamb slain for the Christians (1 Cor. v. 7), and thus just at the point where the Christian cultus had its connection with the Jewish, every part of it was invested

¹ Tert. de praescr. haer. c. 41: Non omittam ipsius etiam conversationis haereticæ descriptionem, quam futilis, quam terrena, quam humana sit sine gravitate sine auctoritate sine disciplina ut fidei suae congruens. Imprimis quis catechumenus, quis fidelis, incertum est; pariter adeunt, pariter audiunt, pariter orant, ethnici, si supervenerint; sanctum canibus et porcis margaritas, licet non veras, jactabunt. Simplicitatem volunt esse prostrationem disciplinae (treading under foot the order of the Church, they call this simplicity), cujus penes nos curam lenocinium vocant. Ante sunt perfecti catechumeni quam edocti. Ordinationes eorum temerariae, leves, inconstantes. Alius hodie episcopus, cras alius; hodie diaconus, qui cras lector, hodie presbyter, qui cras laicus. Nam et laicis sacerdotalia munera injungunt.

² For this he appealed to Gal. vi. 6. He interpreted this passage, Jerome tells us in his Commentary on the Epistle, in such a way, ut putaret fideles et catechumenos simul orare debere et magistrum communicare in oratione discipulis, illo vel maxime elatus, quod sequatur: in omnibus bonis.

³ Tert. de orat. 14: nonne solemnior erit statio tua, si et ad aram Dei steteris?

⁴ Ep. 62.

with a higher significance, and the conflict of feelings and moods, in the sphere of which every more highly developed cultus moves, became richer and more intense. In the period of fasting which preceded the passover, the Christian, in sympathy with the Redeemer, had gone into all the sorrows of his passion; in the joy of the resurrection in the Quinquagesima which followed Quadregesima, he was at liberty, as Tertullian expresses it,¹ *omni exaltatione decurrere*, and this joy, exalting and strengthening his self-consciousness remained with him as the feeling deeper than all others, accompanying him in all the changes of his life, and always proving more than a match for gloom and sorrow.

The same testimony to the prevailing gladness of the Christians is borne, and in a marked manner by another branch of the Christian cultus, which proceeded at a very early date partly from the Christian feeling of piety, and partly from a view of the relation of the human to the divine, which was akin to the heathen religion.

The Christians of the first age held very sacred the memory of the departed, and had a lively sense of continued communion with them, and on the anniversaries of their deaths honoured them with prayers and oblations. Especially were the days on which the martyrs had finished their victorious struggle celebrated in the most joyful way, not as death-days, but as birthdays. In this way the Church of Smyrna kept the anniversary of the martyrdom of Polycarp its bishop.² Legend afterwards adorned still further the miracle of his death; it was said that his body was not consumed by the flames, but transfixed with a dagger and that a dove flew out of it.³ This dove is the symbol of the power of the Holy

¹ De Jej. cap. 14.

² Compare the letter of the Church of Smyrna on the martyrdom of Polycarp in Eusebius iv. 15. The cultus of the martyrs proceeded from the same feeling of piety which prompted the worship of Christ. We worship Christ, the Smyrnaeans say as the Son of God *τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας καὶ μιμητὰς τοῦ κυρίου ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως, ἕνεκα εὐνοίας ἀνυπερβλήτου τῆς εἰς τὸν ἴδιον βασιλεία καὶ διδάσκαλον*. Tertullian speaks, de cor. c. 3, of oblationes pro defunctis, pro nataliciis annua die, Cyprian Ep. 33, speaks not merely of sacrifices for them, but of legends, martyrum passiones, and their anniversaria commemoratio.

³ Compare Ruinart, Acta primorum martyrum, ed. 2, 1713, pp. 35 and 43.

This corrupt passage has been restored by Dr. Nor Bp of Lincoln. There is no mention of a dove proper translation is - "stabbed with a dagger to the very hilt." I have not the Grk. text.

Ghost with which he was inspired, and after the analogy of the eagle which at the funeral of the Roman emperors announced their apotheosis, is a symbol of the new cultus of the saints, by which men were raised to divine favour. The bones of the martyrs were honoured as sacred relics, and the Christians met in pious meditation at the places where they were buried. There was also a desire to share their graves with them, and like the old Egyptian whose highest wish was to be a grave-companion of his Osiris,¹ the Christian counted it his best solace to repose by the side of his martyrs.² The worship of the saints is that side of the Christian

The story of the dove in the text is one of the traits added in the extended version in Eusebius, full as the original account is of legendary details. The prototype of the view expressed in the story is the account of the death of Jesus in the Johannine Gospel, where his side is said (xix. 34) to have been opened by the thrust of a spear, and not only blood, the sign of death, but also water, the emblem of the Holy Spirit, to have flowed from it. John vii. 38 sq.

¹ Plut. de Is. et Osir. c. 20. ὁμοτάφους εἶναι τοῦ σώματος Ὀσίριδος. Compare my Symbolik und Mythol. 2. 2: Stuttg. 1825, p. 412 sq.

² This is spoken of as a custom of old times by one of the most zealous worshippers of the saints, Maximus, Bishop of Turin (in the beginning of the 5th century) in his 51st Homily on the Turin martyrs, Octavius, Adventius, and Solutor. Cuncti martyres devotissime percolendi sunt, sed specialiter ii venerandi sunt a nobis, quorum reliquias possidemus—semper enim nobiscum sunt—hic ne peccatorum nos labe assumat, ibi ne inferni horror invadat. Nam ideo hoc a majoribus provisum est, ut sanctorum ossibus nostra corpora sociemus, ut dum illos tartarus metuit, nos poena non tangat, dum illos Christus illuminat, nobis tenebrarum caligo diffugiat. Cum sanctis ergo martyribus quiescentes evadamus inferi tenebras, eorum propriis meritis, attamen consocii sanctitate. Sicut eis ossibus parentum nostrorum jungimur, ita et eis fidei imitatione jungamur; in nullo enim ab ipsis separari poterimus, si sociemur illis tam religione quam corpore. Patrol. tom. lvii. p. 427. Compare Bellermann, über die ältesten christlichen Begräbnisstätten und besonders die Katakomben zu Neapel. 1839, p. 5. The worship of the saints, which was greatly developed and attained deep influence in religion during the course of the 4th century, rests essentially on the worship of relics which began at so early an age. And it is only by considering how the way of thinking arose and prevailed which lies at the root of relic and saint worship (and this is shown to us in the passage quoted), that we can understand the religious importance which in the eyes of the early Christians attached to their κοιμητήρια and made them τόποι θρησκευτικοί (Euseb. E. H. vii. 13). Before there were ἐκκλησίαι, properly so called, such as arose only in the period between Gallienus and Diocletian (Euseb. viii. 1), the κοιμητήρια were the places for meditation and for religious meetings, and the notions associated with them as the resting places of the martyrs were transferred to the churches.

cultus on which it has the closest affinity with heathen usages and ideas, and manifests the greatest inclination to stretch out a hand for a near and intimate alliance with the heathenism it had overcome. It is also one of the chief elements on the foundation of which the structure of the Christian Church arose which grew to such large proportions in the next succeeding age.

INDEX.

INDEX.

- ABARIS, ii. 147.
 Abel, i. 231.
 Abraham, i. 57, 116, 138; ii. 207.
 Abrasax, i. 218.
 Absolution, ii. 46.
 Acesius, Novatian bishop, ii. 126.
 Achamoth, i. 190.
 Acts of the Apostles, i. 44, 93, 98, 108;
 Paulinism of, 132.
 Adam and Christ, i. 70, 118, 198, 202,
 232, 242.
 — and Eve, i. 231.
 Adresianes, i. 239.
 Aeons, i. 194, 206, 238.
 Africa, Church of, ii. 44.
 — warm blood of, ii. 261.
 Agapae, ii. 33, 282.
 Alcibiades, ii. 44, 270.
 Alexander the Great, i. 3, 18.
 — of Abonoteichos, ii. 141, 171.
 — bishop of Alexandria, ii. 25, 223.
 — Severus, ii. 206, 208.
 Alexandria, i. 18, 189, 205.
 — Church of, ii. 25, 52.
 — Mother of Gnosticism, ii. 3.
 Alexandrine Judaism, i. 120, 180.
 — Religious philosophy, i. 188.
 Allegory, i. 19, 83, 120, 138, 144, 177,
 188, 191, 235; ii. 6.
 Ambrosius, ii. 142.
 Ammonius Saccas, ii. 186.
 Anaxarchus, ii. 158.
 Angels, ii. 70, 86, 88, 123, 162.
 Anicetus, i. 163, 176.
 Antichrist, i. 87, 234; ii. 195.
 Antinomianism, ii. 253.
 Antinous, ii. 147.
 Antioch, i. 45, 51, 55, 152; ii. 38.
 Antiochus Epiphanes, ii. 181.
 Antitactae, ii. 253.
 Antoninus Pius, ii. 201.
 Ἀπαρχαί, ii. 17, 37.
 Apocalypse, i. 24, 81, 84, 113, 153, 162,
 246, 250; ii. 28, 248; Christology of,
 ii. 75, 194; anti-Pauline, i. 84; view
 of heathens, i. 87; number twelve in,
 i. 142.
 Ἀποκατάστασις, the Gnostic, i. 219.
 Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, i. 164,
 170.
 — of Laodicea, ii. 180.
 Apollonius of Tyana, ii. 171, 174, 185,
 207.
 Apologists, i. 2; ii. 136, 187, 199, 201.
 Apostles, i. 53, 60, 80; number of, 85,
 139, 142; missi, ii. 12.
 Apostolic Council, i. 108.
 Apostolic Fathers, i. 137.
 Apostolical Constitutions, i. 150; ii. 37,
 39.
 Appion, ii. 188.
 Archon, i. 217.
 Arianism, ii. 112.
 Aristas, ii. 147, 185.
 Aristotle, i. 192.
 Arius, ii. 113, 223.
 Artemon, ii. 100.
 Asceticism, ii. 250, 263.
 Asclepius, ii. 147, 158.
 Asia Minor, Churches of, i. 84, 154, 164;
 ii. 44, 283.
 Athanasius, ii. 118.
 Atheism, ii. 132.
 Athenagoras, ii. 90, 249, 260.
 Augustus, ii. 129.
 Axionicus, i. 239.

BABYLON, i. 151; ii. 194.

Balaamites, i. 84.

Baptism, i. 107, 143; ii. 21, 44.

Bardesanes, i. 213.

Barnabas, i. 52, 97, 134, 138.

Basilides, i. 192, 205, 213, 239; ii. 252.

— sources of doctrine of, i. 222.

Beryllus, ii. 102.

Bishop, ii. 16; notion of, ii. 26; bishop of bishops, ii. 37; representative of God and Christ, ii. 29, 35, 39; organ of unity, ii. 33; duties of, ii. 24, 53; rights of, ii. 60; of Rome, ii. 44, 47.

Bishops, successors of the Apostles, ii. 41; represent the Church, ii. 56; opponents of Montanism, ii. 45; and prophets, ii. 53, 125; celibacy of, ii. 267.

Böhmer, ii. 195.

Bunsen, ii. 32, 101.

Burckhardt, ii. 213, 227.

CAJUS, i. 149; ii. 52.

Callistus, bishop of Rome, ii. 44, 93, 101, 206, 243, 266, 269.

Canon of Scripture, i. 148; ii. 11.

Carpocrates, ii. 253.

Cassianus, i. 238; ii. 257.

Cathari, ii. 124.

Catholicism, Catholic Church, i. 99, 103, 125, 128, 130, 135, 147, 153, 180, 185; ii. 1, 13, 63, 217, 274; corpus Christianorum, ii. 221.

Celbes, a Gnostic, i. 203.

Celsus, ii. 140; the Epicurean, ii. 141, 167; considers Jesus a deceiver, ii. 166; significance of, ii. 166.

Cerintus, i. 199; ii. 52.

Christ: Christ and Socrates, i. 12; party of, i. 61; priesthood of, ii. 115; death of, i. 119, 122, 126, 131, 156, 178; centre of the universe, i. 122; Son of God, i. 121; ii. 71; a prophet, i. 126, 234; ii. 34; a legislator, i. 146; ruler of world to come, i. 230; body of, i. 125, 238; the true passover, i.

171; Lord of the Church, ii. 28; the Christ of Gnosticism, i. 197, 225, 229, 241, 254; Chrestus, ii. 191; appearance of, ii. 280.

Christianity, connection with what preceded it, i. 23; with Roman Empire, i. 3, 5; ii. 129, 226; universalism of, i. 2, 49, 80, 121, 132, 180; absolute nature of, i. 6, 9, 124; ii. 4; fundamental view of, i. 27; moral character of, i. 13, 29, 33, 37; ii. 235; relation to pre-Christian religions, i. 8. 17; to Greek philosophy, i. 11, 13, 189; ii. 9; to Judaism, i. 17; religion of humanity, i. 111; and Judaism (Paul), i. 65, 71; represented as Gnosis, i. 138; Χριστιανισμός, i. 139; union of Jew and Gentile, i. 123; breach of, with Judaism, i. 158; essence of, according to the Gnostics, i. 220; relation of, to the State, ii. 211.

Christians, counted atheists, ii. 132, 171; their flagitia, ii. 133, 165; their odium generis humani, ii. 132, 193; Celsus's view of them, ii. 134, 147, 159, 165, 231; Lucian's, ii. 172; sectarians and raisers of sedition, ii. 147, 164; sense of poverty of, i. 27; ii. 233; world-consciousness of, i. 29; ii. 129; persecutions of, ii. 190, 192, 200, 205, 213; brothers, ii. 170, 240; priests, ii. 265; Christiani, ii. 192, 200; moral attitude of, ii. 235; attitude to civil government, ii. 248.

Chronicon Paschale, i. 164, 169, 170.

Church, a pure virgin, i. 89, 97, 205; unity of, i. 125; ii. 27; in the Clementine Homilies, ii. 35; in Hermas, ii. 126, 273; the only saving, ii. 124; the Montanist, ii. 49, 125; the visible, ii. 126; power of the keys of, ii. 46, 53; Church and world, ii. 48, 50; Church and spirit, ii. 53.

Cicero, i. 15.

Circumcision, i. 52, 69, 106, 138, 143, 157, 182.

Clemens, Flavius, ii. 196.

Clement of Alexandria, i. 103, 148, 164,

- 170, 215, 238; ii. 3, 23, 24, 92, 139, 247, 252; on faith and knowledge, ii. 3; Gnosticism of, ii. 4; on church offices, ii. 24; on ethics, ii. 238, 275.
- Clement of Rome, i. 90, 111, 152; ii. 196; companion of the apostle Peter, ii. 38; epistles of, i. 140; ii. 18, 86; pseudo-Clementine writings, i. 90, 106, 109, 111, 128; ii. 34, 55; their notion of unity, ii. 38; Clementine Homilies, i. 55, 90, 106, 109, 111, 126, 228; ii. 25, 34, 37, 41, 89, 99, 188, 260; Clementine Recognitions, i. 108, 111; ii. 25.
- Cleomedes, ii. 147.
- Cleomenes, the Monarchian, ii. 93.
- Clergy and laity, ii. 21; celibacy of, ii. 265.
- Colarbasus, i. 213.
- Colossians, Epistle to, i. 122.
- Commodus, ii. 206.
- Constantine, ii. 215, 218; his desire for unity, ii. 222; his greatness, ii. 226; baptism of, ii. 227.
- Corinthian Church and Epistles, i. 61, 85.
- Cornelius, bishop of Rome, ii. 43.
- Council of Nicaea, i. 172.
- Creator, i. 195, 199, 224, 228.
- Cureton, ii. 32.
- Cynics, ii. 171.
- Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, ii. 18, 20, 41, 43, 51, 56, 124.
- DÄHNE, i. 21.
- Daniel, ii. 159, 180.
- Deacons, ii. 16, 24.
- Decius, ii. 208.
- Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, ii. 25.
- Demiurgus, i. 195, 209, 217, 225, 229, 235.
- Demonology, ii. 123, 153, 159, 183, 186, 196, 245.
- Devil, i. 230; ii. 156.
- Diocletian, ii. 210, 213.
- Diognetus, Epist. ad Diognetum, ii. 131.
- Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, ii. 111.
- Dionysos, ii. 147.
- Disciples, i. 79.
- Docetae, i. 237.
- Docetism, i. 237; of Marcion, i. 239; of Clement of Alexandria, ii. 5; consequences of, ii. 8.
- Dogma, ii. 62.
- Döllinger, ii. 101, 243, 266, 270.
- Domitian, ii. 176, 196.
- Donatists, ii. 223.
- Dualism, i. 187, 193, 223; ii. 249, 252.
- EASTER, i. 161, 163, 174; ii. 286.
- Ebionites, i. 89, 96, 181; ii. 270.
- Ebionitism and Paulinism, i. 100.
- Eclecticism, i. 13, 15; ii. 175.
- Ecstasy, i. 51, 62; ii. 54.
- Egypt, land of sorcerers, ii. 166; allegorical reference to, i. 203.
- Elcesaites, i. 108; ii. 44, 270.
- Eleutheros, bishop of Rome, ii. 22, 47.
- Emanation, i. 194; ii. 92, 110, 119.
- Emesa, ii. 207.
- Empedocles, i. 192; ii. 9.
- Enkratites, i. 238; ii. 258.
- Enoch, i. 231.
- Ephesians, Epistle to, i. 122.
- Ephesus, i. 60, 86.
- Epictetus, i. 15; ii. 158, 173.
- Epicureanism, i. 11, 14, 174.
- Epicureans, ii. 141, 168, 173.
- Epicurus, ii. 9.
- Epigonus, a Monarchian, ii. 93.
- Epiphanes, a Gnostic, ii. 253.
- Episcopate, i. 112; ii. 15, 30, 35, 40, 226, 229; principle of, ii. 26, 41; and heresy, ii. 29; opposition of, to Monarchism, ii. 45, 52, 55; friendship of Constantine to, ii. 222; ἐπίσκοποι, ii. 17; difference of, from presbyteri, ii. 24; Episcopal succession, ii. 43.
- Essences, i. 20, 108; ii. 270.
- Ethics, Christian, ii. 233 *sq.*, 260, 264, 269.
- Eucharist, i. 173; ii. 33, 282.
- Euchites, ii. 133.
- Eumapius, ii. 184.
- Euphrates, a Gnostic, i. 203.
- Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, ii. 22, 25, 44, 120, 180, 185, 210, 227.

- FAITH** and works, i. 113, 126, 128, 179, 141.
Fasts, ii. 271, 285; before Easter, i. 167.
Firmilian, bishop, ii. 42, 44, 56.
Flesh, the Christian view of, ii. 249.
- GALATIANS**, i. 52, 56, 96.
Galerius, ii. 212.
Gallienus, ii. 210.
Gentiles, i. 51, 106, 134.
Georgii, i. 18.
Gieseler, i. 168, 174, 186; ii. 47, 104.
Gnosticism, i. 138, 184; in New Testament, i. 127; a religious philosophy, i. 192; ii. 1; dualism of, i. 193; three principles of, i. 197; idealism of, i. 221, 240; absolute knowledge, i. 235; forms of, i. 199, 235; its relation to Christianity, ii. 2; *γνώσις* and *πίστις*, i. 188; ii. 3; pantheism of, i. 232; of Clement Alexandr., ii. 4; heathen origin of, ii. 9; and Montanism, i. 254; ii. 1.
Gospel, a twofold, i. 54.
Gospels, i. 24; synoptic, ii. 264; of the Egyptians, ii. 99, 259.
Gregorovius, ii. 170.
Gymnosophists, ii. 239.
- HADRIAN**, ii. 147, 203.
Hauber, ii. 258.
Heathenism, i. 6, 10, 96; ii. 159; demonic, ii. 244; Judaism and Christianity, i. 107, 121, 155, 158, 164, 186, 225, 235; and Christianity, ii. 163, 195, 230.
Hebdomad, i. 217; ii. 4.
Hebrews, i. 45; Epistle to, i. 114, 138; ii. 20; Alexandrine origin of, i. 121.
Hegesippus, i. 88, 96; ii. 25, 38.
Helena, i. 200.
Heliogabalus, ii. 206.
Hellenism, i. 18, 190.
Hellenists, i. 4, 45.
Hellwag, ii. 88.
Heracleon, i. 213, 239.
Heracles, ii. 147, 158.
Heraclitus, i. 192; ii. 9, 94, 156.
- Heresies**, i. 192; ii. 10, 14, 30; the seven Jewish, i. 96.
Heretics, ii. 14.
Hermas, i. 140; ii. 21, 50, 86, 126, 264, 272.
Hermotimus, ii. 147.
Hierarchy, notion of, ii. 59.
Hierocles, ii. 184, 212.
Hilgenfeld, i. 20, 24, 41, 53, 77, 79, 90, 97, 104, 121, 131, 137, 139, 141, 153, 162, 171, 182, 222; ii. 27.
Hippolytus, i. 169; author of the *Philosophoumena*, ii. 181, 270.
Holsten, i. 48, 53, 55, 59.
Homer, i. 190; ii. 144.
Homocousia, ii. 107, 110, 118, 127.
Horos, i. 208.
Hosius, bishop, ii. 221.
Hyginus, bishop of Rome, i. 176.
- IAMBELICHUS**, ii. 184.
Idolatry, ii. 245.
Idols, flesh offered to, i. 84, 145.
Ignatius, Epistles of, i. 128, 139, 238; ii. 27, 31, 87; a Paulinist, ii. 32, 38; his idea of unity, ii. 33; his martyrdom, ii. 200.
Indulgences, ii. 50.
Irenaeus, i. 103, 148, 164, 168; ii. 8, 14, 24, 41, 43, 91.
Isidorus, a Gnostic, i. 213.
- JAMES**, i. 129, 134; ii. 25; bishop of Jerusalem, i. 90; ii. 29; Epistle of, i. 128.
Jerome, i. 84; ii. 22, 181.
Jerusalem, parent Church of, i. 44, 74; Paul at, i. 52; and Gerizim, i. 155; the heavenly, i. 248, 255.
Jesus, the significance of his person, i. 25, 38; two elements in his personality, i. 49; his relation to the Old Testament, i. 29, 103; his doctrine of the kingdom of God, i. 33; his Messianic idea, i. 38; the duration of his ministry, i. 41; his death and resurrection, i. 42; the significance of his death, i. 157; ii. 9; the day of his death, i. 159; his

- miracles, ii. 166; a lawgiver, i. 146; called a sophist, ii. 173; his disciples, ii. 165, 182; the seventy, i. 80; the name of, ii. 245. See Christ.
 Jewish Christianity, i. 100.
 Jews, i. 4, 18; at Alexandria, i. 19; their unbelief, i. 156; their want of culture, ii. 132, 151.
 Joel, i. 250.
 John, the Apostle, i. 24, 165; at Ephesus, i. 86; author of the Apocalypse, i. 153, 174; the Apocalyptic writer and the Evangelist, i. 153, 175; the beloved disciple, i. 178; the Gospel of, i. 24, 33, 153, 177; ii. 56.
 John the Baptist, i. 232.
 Jonah, ii. 159.
 Judaism, i. 6, 17; Alexandrian, i. 19, 144; particularism of, i. 18, 46, 68, 72, 179; a religion of law, i. 57; and heathenism, i. 87; mediating between the Old Testament and Christianity, i. 117; the absolute religion, i. 235. See Heathenism and Christianity.
 Judaism and Paulinism, i. 106, 112.
 Judaists opponents of the apostle Paul, i. 52, 56, 60, 93, 95, 106; emissaries from Jerusalem, i. 56.
 Julia Domna, the Empress, ii. 174, 206.
 Justin Martyr, i. 88, 103, 142, 176, 182; ii. 138, 200; not a Paulinist, i. 147; his gospels, i. 147.
 KEIM, ii. 203, 215.
 Κήρυγμα Πέτρου, i. 90.
 Κλῆρος, ii. 21.
 Köstlin, i. 24, 26, 77, 79, 80, 121, 136, 153, 162, 236.
 Kuhn, ii. 102, 112.
 LACTANTIUS, ii. 215.
 Laity, ii. 22.
 Lamech, ii. 258.
 Laodicea, i. 164.
 Lassalle, ii. 96.
 Law, i. 30, 57, 71, 108, 116, 129, 141, 157, 179, 224.
 Law and Gospel, i. 224, 227, 233.
 Lechler, i. 52, 104, 171.
 Lehmann, ii. 191, 193.
 Licinius, ii. 215, 218, 228.
 Linus, bishop of Rome, i. 152.
 Lipsius, i. 141; ii. 32.
 Logos, idea of, i. 145, 155; ii. 75, 79, 83, 96.
 Λόγος σπερματικός, ii. 139.
 Lord's Supper, i. 161, 174; ii. 21, 280.
 Lucian, ii. 141, 167, 231.
 Lücke, i. 24.
 Lugdunum, ii. 205.
 Luke, Gospel of, i. 26, 27, 77, 79.
 MAESA, ii. 207.
 Magic, i. 96; ii. 166, 245.
 Manicheism, Manichees, i. 223, 236; ii. 133, 211.
 Marcia, ii. 206.
 Marcion, i. 82, 97, 192, 205, 223, 235; his Gospel, i. 79; his Paulinism, i. 83; his dislike of allegory, i. 83; and of hierarchical distinctions, ii. 286; on marriage, ii. 255.
 Marcus Aurelius, i. 15; ii. 129, 171, 172, 205.
 Marcus the Gnostic, i. 213.
 Mark, the Evangelist, i. 151; ii. 25; his Gospel, i. 25, 141.
 Marriage, i. 251; ii. 240, 251; mixed marriages, ii. 241; second marriage, ii. 258; of clergy, ii. 265.
 Martyrdom, i. 251; ii. 22, 123, 169, 172, 205, 209, 244, 278, 288.
 Mary, i. 218, 239.
 Matthew, Gospel of, i. 26, 78, 170.
 Maxentius, ii. 225.
 Maximian, ii. 232.
 Maximilla, i. 247, 255.
 Maximin, ii. 220, 232.
 Maximus, bishop of Turin, ii. 288.
 Melchisedek, i. 116.
 Melito, i. 2, 164; ii. 129, 201, 204.
 Messiah, i. 38, 48, 246.
 Methodius, bishop of Tyre, ii. 180.
 Millenarianism, i. 247; ii. 2, 52.
 Miltiades, ii. 55.
 Miracles, i. 1, 22.

Möhler, ii. 148, 243.
 Monarchians, ii. 92, 100.
 Monogamy, ii. 259, 266.
 Montanism, i. 245; ii. 45, 63; was a reaction, i. 251; ii. 46; its relation to Gnosticism, i. 254; its rigorism, ii. 45; its prophecy, ii. 53.
 Montanus, i. 248, 255.
 Mortal sins, ii. 46, 49.
 Moses, i. 65, 90, 138, 145, 204, 231, 253; ii. 34, 157, 181.
 Mysteries, i. 236; ii. 169.
 Mythology, Greek, i. 196.
 Myths, i. 6, 189, 196, 205; ii. 132, 144.

 NAASSENES, i. 202.
 Nazarites, i. 134, 182.
 Neander, i. 8; ii. 22; on Gnosticism, i. 186; Montanism, i. 255; Sabellius, ii. 95; Constantine, ii. 225.
 Neo-Platonism, i. 16.
 Neo-Pythagoreanism, ii. 178.
 Nero, Antichrist, ii. 195, 248.
 Niebuhr, ii. 207, 210, 215.
 Nicolaitans, i. 84; ii. 253.
 Nitzsch, ii. 143.
 Noah's ark, ii. 124, 270.
 Noetus, ii. 94, 96.
 Novatus, Novatianus, Novatians, ii. 124, 271.
 Numbers, i. 206, 232; ii. 4.

 OGDOD, i. 208, 217; ii. 4.
 Old Testament, typical significance of, i. 117, 124, 143, 157, 176, 189; Jesus' view of, i. 29; parts of (Justin), i. 143; sensuous views of (Celsus), ii. 151; in contradiction with the new, i. 82; ii. 157; relation to the new, i. 117.
 Ophites, i. 202, 237.
 Orpheus, ii. 146, 207.
 Origen, i. 4, 103, 148; ii. 3, 6, 108, 163, 181, 186, 188, 208, 243, 272.

 PANTHERA, ii. 143.
 Paphnutius, ii. 266.
 Papias, i. 88.
 Parables of New Testament, i. 36, 79.

Paraclete, i. 248, 250; ii. 53, 56.
 Paret, i. 50.
 Parousia, i. 246; ii. 45, 51.
 Paschal controversy, i. 160.
 Paschal Lamb, i. 159.
 Passover, i. 160, 165, 177.
 Pastoral Epistles, i. 127; ii. 30, 265.
 Patriarchs of Old Testament, i. 143, 182.
 Patripassianism, ii. 93.
 Paul, the Apostle, i. 46; his conversion, i. 46, 57; his relation to Jesus, i. 48, 50; to the older apostles, i. 49, 52, 135; his conflict with Peter, i. 54, 83, 92; his Epistles, i. 56, 61, 66, 150; his religious view of the world, i. 59, 65, 70, 118, 198; his apostolical authority, i. 61; his doctrine, i. 59, 101, 113, 116; his universalism, i. 67, 81, 109, 113, 121; his refutation of Jewish particularism, i. 71; his sympathy with his fellow-countrymen, i. 71, 73; collection for the Christians of Jerusalem, i. 74, 95, 98; his death, i. 75; his journeys, i. 74, 98, 151; his opponents, i. 56, 86, 93, 111; co-apostle of Peter, i. 150; calls Christ the Passover, i. 160; knows no permanent church office, ii. 18; on marriage, ii. 251; on slavery, ii. 243, 251; on cultus, ii. 279.
 Paul of Samosata, ii. 105.
 Penance, ii. 47, 125.
 Peratae, i. 191, 203.
 Peregrinus Proteus, ii. 168.
 Persecutions, i. 45, 76; ii. 192, 196, 205, 208, 213.
 Peter, the apostle, i. 53, 61, 93; primacy of, i. 80, 149, 178; *Κήρυγμα Πέτρου*, i. 90; in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, i. 91, 242; ii. 35; apostle of the Gentiles, i. 109; ii. 36; Epistles of, i. 128, 150, 247; his cathedra in Rome, ii. 43.
 Peter and Paul, i. 130, 133, 140, 148, 154; ii. 38.
 Peter, bishop of Alexandria, ii. 283.
 Pherecydes, ii. 156.
 Philip, the apostle, i. 165.

- Philippians, Epistle to, i. 127; ii. 79.
 Philip the Arabian, ii. 208.
 Philo, i. 21, 189.
 Philosophoumena of Pseudo-Origen, i. 171, 190, 192, 211, 213; ii. 94, 101, 269.
 Philosophy, Greek, i. 10, 20, 189, 192; origin of the heresies, i. 191; ii. 10; philosophy and religion, i. 196; the philosopher's pallium, ii. 136.
 Philostratus, ii. 174, 184.
 Πίστις Σοφία, i. 211, 236.
 Pius, bishop of Rome, i. 176.
 Planck, i. 100.
 Plato, Platonism, i. 11, 16, 189, 192, 195; ii. 9, 155, 158; Neo-Platonism, ii. 179, 187.
 Pleroma, Gnostic, i. 207; in Ephesian and Colossian Epistles, ii. 77.
 Pliny, the younger, ii. 197, 236.
 Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, i. 140, 163; ii. 27, 172.
 Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, i. 163.
 Polytheism, ii. 186, 230, 245.
 Poppaea Sabina, ii. 193.
 Porphyrius, ii. 179, 184, 186.
 Praedicatio Pauli, i. 56.
 Praxeas, ii. 47, 92.
 Presbyter, ii. 16, 21, 24, 29.
 Priesthood of Christ, i. 116; of Christians, ii. 21, 265; of Judaism in Christian Church, ii. 38.
 Priscilla, i. 248, 255.
 Prophets of Old Testament, i. 241, 247; ii. 53; of Montanism, i. 248.
 Proselytes, i. 108; ii. 193, 230.
 Pseudonymity, i. 136; ii. 36, 204.
 Ptolemaeus, a Gnostic, i. 176, 213, 239.
 Pythagoras, i. 192; ii. 9, 183; Neo-Pythagoreanism, ii. 178.
 QUARTODECIMANS, i. 166, 170, 173, 181.
 RAMPSINITUS, ii. 146.
 Rationalism, i. 243.
 Rebaptists, ii. 44.
 Redemption, i. 240.
 Redepennig, ii. 111.
 Regulae fidei, ii. 14.
 Religion, the principle of religious development, i. 10, 117; the primitive (Clementine), ii. 34; essence of, ii. 187; religious liberty, ii. 187, 220; and the State, ii. 211; religio licita, ii. 192, 211, 217; edicts of, ii. 199, 201, 207, 215, 220.
 Resurrection, ii. 154, 157, 249.
 Revelation, ii. 149, 153.
 Romans, Epistle to, i. 66.
 Rome, Roman Empire, i. 2, 3; ii. 129, 190, 196.
 — Church of, i. 67, 141, 148, 152, 164, 180, 205; ii. 269; the Church of the Apostles, i. 149; its growing pre-eminence, ii. 44; its catholicising endeavours, ii. 44; first scheme of indulgences, ii. 50.
 Ritschl, i. 20, 29, 79, 82, 90, 100, 108, 121, 136, 162, 167, 182; ii. 22, 27, 32, 50.
 Rothe, ii. 25, 27, 34.
 SABBATH, i. 157.
 Sabellius, ii. 94, 96, 103, 112.
 Sacrifice, i. 108, 118; ii. 181.
 Salome, ii. 257.
 Samaria, i. 79, 96.
 Saturninus, a Gnostic, i. 213; ii. 255.
 Schneckenburger, i. 132.
 Schwegler, i. 79, 100, 127, 136, 256; ii. 37, 201.
 Scripture, authority of, ii. 11.
 Secundus, a Gnostic, i. 213.
 Seneca, i. 15, 16.
 Septimius Severus, ii. 174, 206.
 Sermon on the Mount, i. 26.
 Serpent, i. 202.
 Sethians, i. 191.
 Silvanus, i. 131, 151.
 Simon Magus, i. 91, 99, 110, 192, 200, 232; ii. caricature of the apostle Paul, i. 91; the father of simony, i. 95; of heretics, i. 96, 199; his end at Rome, i. 97.
 Slavery, ii. 148, 243, 251.
 Smyrna, ii. 205.

- Socrates, i. 12.
 Sophia, i. 207, 211, 229, 232, 239.
 Soter, i. 198, 208.
 Spirit and matter, i. 175, 193, 211, 223, 227, 235, 240; ii. 7; and flesh, i. 253, 255; ii. 249, 252, 263; the Holy Spirit, i. 95, 178, 208, 216, 242, 250.
 Spiritales and psychici, ii. 124.
 Stationes, i. 251.
 Stauros, i. 208.
 Steitz, i. 168.
 Stephanas, ii. 17.
 Stephanus, bishop of Rome, ii. 43.
 Stoicism, Stoics, i. 11, 189; ii. 174.
 Succession, Episcopal, ii. 15.
 Suetonius, ii. 191.
 Sunday, i. 166, 172; ii. 284.
 Sun-worship, ii. 174, 207.
 Supernaturalism, Gnostic, i. 243; contra and supra naturam, ii. 154.
 Syncretism, ii. 178, 206.
 Synods, ii. 57.
 Synod of Ancyra, ii. 24; Carthage, ii. 24; Antioch, ii. 107; Rome, ii. 112; Elvira, ii. 280, 285; œcumenical, at Nicaea, ii. 64, 118, 126, 224.
 Sycophants, ii. 201, 203.
 Syzygies, i. 200, 206, 230.
 Tacitus, ii. 133, 164, 192, 195.
 Talmud, ii. 143.
 Tatian, i. 238; ii. 90, 257.
 Telesphorus, i. 176.
 Tertullian, i. 103, 148, 191, 205; ii. 8, 10, 11, 20, 41, 91, 137; as Montanist, i. 252; ii. 47, 54, 126, 130; contest with Marcion, i. 83; on religious liberty, ii. 188, 199; on the number of the Christians, ii. 232; on the spectacles, ii. 236; on marriage, ii. 240, 258; on idolatry, ii. 246; on martyrdom, ii. 278.
 Testament of the twelve patriarchs, i. 182.
 Thales, i. 192; ii. 9.
 Theism and Pantheism, ii. 149, 152.
 Theodotus of Byzantium, ii. 100.
 Theophilus of Antioch, ii. 90.
 Therapeutae, i. 20.
 Theseus, ii. 146.
 Thessalonians, second Epistle to, ii. 195.
 Tiberius, ii. 191.
 Titus, assistant to the apostle, i. 52, 135.
 Tradition, ii. 11.
 Trajan, ii. 197.
 Types, i. 117, 138, 144, 158, 176.
 UHLHORN, i. 90, 104, 108; ii. 31.
 VALENTINUS, i. 192, 205, 220; ii. 252.
 Valentinians, i. 190, 206, 239; the two schools of, i. 239.
 Valerian, ii. 209.
 Venial sins, ii. 46, 49, 268.
 Victor, bishop of Rome, i. 163, 176; ii. 47, 100.
 Vigils, ii. 284.
 Virginity, ii. 259.
 Vogel, ii. 210, 214.
 Volkmar, i. 79, 97, 141, 152, 213; ii. 96.
 WEISS, i. 131.
 Weitzel, i. 167, 170.
 Widow, ii. 258.
 Wife, the Christian, ii. 240.
 Wolff, ii. 82.
 Works, i. 113, 127; ii. 271.
 XEROPHAGIAE, i. 251.
 Xystus, bishop of Rome, i. 176.
 ZACCHAEUS, ii. 35.
 Zamolxis, ii. 146.
 Zeller, i. 13, 14, 20, 53, 97, 108, 189.
 Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome, ii. 47, 101, 269.
 Zeus, ii. 147, 157.



SEPT 75

N. MANCHESTER,

